LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

THE WAY TO PEACE

J. D. BERNAL, F.R.S.

January, 1951

Price: One Shilling

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'A NEW YEAR, A NEW READER'

It needs the people to stop war, to win peace—an aroused, alert and active people: that is, and always will be, our only security. As our old friend of many years' standing, 'Socialist Sailor', wrote to me: 'I am one of some 2,000 million human beings in the world, and 95 per cent. of us—or more—want peace, and we are going to achieve it, and *Labour Monthly* helps nobly on this path'. A new reader, after studying *Korea Handbook*, comes out in blunt and simple style: 'I've been a Labour supporter for years, and I have been puzzled and extremely disappointed with our Government. We should be on the side of the North Koreans against the real invaders and aggressors, the American gangsters'. This has an echo from the U.S., where a woman reader, thanking us for our long series of articles against aggression and war, stresses that 'on both sides of the Atlantic there are *some* who are devoted to peace and decency instead of war'.

Indeed, a good half of the letters we receive refer to our 'steadfast fight for peace and socialism'; they can be summed up in this contribution from Yorkshire: 'Some day, no doubt, *Labour Monthly* readers and supporters will meet and testify to all that this periodical has done and is going to do to help the world to Peace, Prosperity and Progress'. To them all I would say: turn to the middle pages of this issue and read the Editorial Board's statement, at the opening of this year during which *Labour Monthly* celebrates its first thirty years, about our circulation and our plans. You will see the suggestion that a good resolution is to 'begin the new year by winning a new reader'. Each month in this column we shall print more about how to increase the circulation and thus the understanding and strength of action needed to stop the war. We will exchange readers' own ideas about raising circulation.

Here is circulation-raiser No. 1—*Free Specimen Copies*. It came from the North of England, in this form: 'I sent copies of a recent number to six leading members of the Labour Party here. I got appreciative letters in reply and some said they would get it regularly in future. I have others in mind, but I can't afford more copies. Could you send a free specimen to these two, mentioning my name?' I did; one of them (a Labour Alderman) took out a subscription by return. On the back cover you will find a form with room for two names and addresses. Fill it in, post it to us in a 1d. stamped envelope, and we will do the rest. If you like to add a covering note of your own to be forwarded with the specimen copy, better still.

There has been a stunning greeting for the December number. From the East: 'Better than ever! The index speaks volumes; congratulations on a wonderful year's production. And may 1951 be a year of working-class advance everywhere, with *Labour Monthly*, truly the Magazine of International Labour, well to the fore'. From the West: 'A new high water mark. The editorial article on Shaw is very grand; I wish he had been alive to read it. I'm so pleased that it is being reprinted with Shaw's own article as a pamphlet. Please send me 10 copies the moment they are out. Gallacher's *Yankee Yesmen*, too—most beautifully written. Here are two that go to the heart

Continued on inside back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXIII, No. 1

CONTENTS

January, 1951

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: After Washington, by R.P.D.	1
THE WAY TO PEACE: by J. D. Bernal, F.R.S.	12
U.S. IMPERIALISM, *the most dangerous enemy of the Chinese People*: by Teh Kao	29
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	32
THE RIGHT TO STRIKE: by D. A. Michaelson	33
THE GROWING REVOLT IN THE MIDDLE EAST: by C. Allen	37
DOCUMENT OF THE MONTH: Ten Points for Peace	41
EDITORIAL BOARD STATEMENT	24-25
Book Reviews:	
Old Friends to Keep, by T. A. Jackson: *Harry Pollitt*	43
The London Trades Council: *Wal Hannington*	44
High Treason, by Albert E. Kahn: *F. Carter*	46
Public Opinion in Soviet Russia, by Alex Inkeles: *Judith Todd*	47
Two Worlds in Focus; Studies of the Cold War: *Dick Freeman*	48
Publications Received	48

Notes of the Month

After Washington

The British people are now striving to correct the Labour Government's mistaken policy of making Britain follow the lead of the frantic American adventurists.

Best wishes for the success of the struggle now being waged by British patriots.

MAO TSE-TUNG, December, 1950.

WITH the New Year of 1951 we are entering on what is likely to prove the year of decision for the fate of Britain and the future of war or peace. The Washington Agreement of President Truman and Premier Attlee has increased, not diminished, the menace of major war. But a new current is stirring through the world. The Chinese people's courageous stand by the side of the Korean people for national freedom and peace against the aggressors and invaders has transformed the world situation. A major crisis is developing throughout the American War Alliance. The World Peace Congress

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at Warsaw has raised to a new height the movement for peace. The British people have demonstrated in a mighty national upsurge of all sections that they do not wish to be dragged behind the mad dog war policies of MacArthur or the atom bomb threats of Truman. The deep conflict of interests between the reckless war drive of American expansion and the desperate internal problems, economic enfeeblement and popular discontent of the European satellites can no longer be concealed. In vain Attlee flew to Truman to paper the cracks and cement anew the war alliance on the basis of fresh British surrenders. The Washington Agreement out-Munichs Munich. But Munich solved nothing. The contradictions grew, and the outcome tore Chamberlain's paper agreement to fragments. The Washington Agreement solves nothing. The contradictions remain. The new Battle for Britain, of which we wrote already four years ago in the opening stages of the Anglo-American Alliance, has come into the open. The fight goes forward, and will go forward with ever greater strength—the fight for the freedom of Britain and the future of peace.

Lenin's Foresight

Thirty-two years ago Lenin, in his Address on Soviet foreign policy to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet on May 14, 1918, analysed the prospect of an imperialist alliance against the socialist revolution in the following terms:

> Two tendencies exist: one which renders the alliance of all imperialists unavoidable; a second which drives one group of imperialists against the other. Two tendencies neither of which rests on a firm basis.

And again:

> The experience of world policy proves that an alliance against Soviet Russia is inevitably doomed to failure because it would be an imperialist alliance, an alliance of robbers who do not agree among each other, and who have no really lasting interests uniting them.

The truth of this boldly confident prevision, spoken at the height of mortal danger of the young and still weak Soviet Republic, was abundantly demonstrated in the fiasco of Churchill's wars of intervention. It was still more powerfully demonstrated in the fate of the Fascist Holy Alliance against socialism, and the breakdown of the Chamberlain-Hitler Munich Four Power Pact under the stress of the contradictions of German and British imperialism, and thanks to the skill of Soviet diplomacy. Today this truth is being demonstrated in new forms in the fate of the present-day Atlantic Holy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alliance of Counter-Revolution. Once again the deep contradictions of American and British imperialism, centred in the Far East, also in the Middle East, in relation to Germany and Japan, in the whole colonial sphere and in economic policy, break through the trappings of the Grand Alliance of United Counter-Revolution. In vain the artificers of the Alliance, the puny Attlees and Trumans, with desperate haste endeavour to close the rift and proclaim their indissoluble unity to the world. The rift shows through. And it is this rift which enables the popular movement to enlarge its range a thousandfold in order to break through and shatter once and for all the bonds of the Slavery Alliance for War.

Pleading for Independence

On November 30, 1950, the Tory Front Bench leader, R. A. Butler, speaking in the parliamentary foreign affairs debate with regard to the prospect of the United States dragging Britain into war with China, bombing Manchuria or using the atom bomb, declared:

> **The British people wish to be assured before their fate is decided in this respect that they are helping to decide their own fate.**

Remarkable and revealing words to come at this moment from the Front Bench of a parliament which once lorded the world. To this point have we come. To this humble lowly prayer, not yet that the British people should decide their own fate, but that they should be kindly allowed to 'help' in deciding it, to have some say, before 'their fate is decided' by the All-High in Washington—or Tokio. This is no Communist speaking. It is no Labour back-bencher. It is the Conservative official spokesman. It is the lieutenant of Fulton Churchill. These words of tortured impotence, of abject pleading that the British people might have some little say in the determination of their fate, would have seemed strange to a Pitt, a Palmerston or a Gladstone, in the days when Britain was still an independent Power and its sovereign parliament sent forth its fiat to the four quarters of the globe. But in the present-day conditions of satellite Britain these words sounded like the first faint tocsin of a Declaration of Independence. They were the feeble echo of the mighty storm of national anger arising outside.

National Upsurge

What made possible the sudden and powerful upsurge of national feeling in the early days of December, the most significant political demonstration and portent since the end of the war, the universal revulsion running through all sections against the fate of Britain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being dragged to catastrophe behind the insane frenzied adventurism of a MacArthur and the atom-bomb-happy antics of a Truman? There is no doubt of the answer to that question. The advance of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese volunteers, scattering in headlong route the massed legions of MacArthur at the very moment of his vainglorious boasts of final victory, precipitated the crisis. For five long years every humiliation had been suffered at the hands of the United States. The Loan Agreement. The Marshall Plan. The Economic Controllers in London. The Atlantic Pact. Trade Restriction. Enforced Devaluation. American Bombers on British soil. All had been suffered with bent backs and bowed heads and an official touching of forelocks to the kind Squire, the purveyor of blankets at Christmas.

China Teaches Courage

Then the change came. The peasant soldiers of China and Korea, the despised 'gooks', suddenly revealed that the God-Almighty Yankee Dictator of Tokio and Washington was not invincible, that in extremity he was liable to panic and run wild, and that the running dogs who linked their fate with his might have reason in the end to regret their association. A wind stirred through Britain and all satellite Europe. Backs began to straighten, and voices began to be found even on the red benches of the House of Lords. Chang from the foundry and Ling from the ricefields had not only struck a blow for their Korean brothers. They had even begun to insert the rudiments of a backbone in Labour M.P.s and Tory Front Benchers. The Chinese and Korean soldiers have not only been fighting for the national freedom of Korea against aggression, for the common cause of all Asia. By their struggle and their sacrifice they have in fact served the cause of the liberation of Britain.

Changing the World

The stand of the Chinese volunteers alongside the Korean People's Army in shattering MacArthur's offensive at the end of November has indeed changed the world. It has brought a military and political transformation of profound significance. As late as October 31 the King's Speech was celebrating the completion of the victory of aggression in Korea:

> In Korea forces for the first time under the flag of the United Nations are overcoming the invaders (*sic*). The success of this historic action in which My forces are playing their part marks a decisive moment in world affairs.

Seldom has the besotted blindness of the Vassal Cabinet of America

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been so cruelly exposed or so mercilessly placed on the record for the harsh comment of the event within a few weeks.

Warnings to the Blind

They could not plead ignorance. The Chinese leaders had given warning again and again. On October 1 Chou En-lai had publicly warned that China ' could not stand idly by ' while America, following the Japanese Tanaka Plan route, was invading and conquering China's neighbour, Korea. Through India the warning had been given that, if MacArthur crossed the 38th Parallel, Chinese action would follow. All warnings were ignored. On October 7 the War Camp controlling the United Nations passed by 47 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions, the resolution which served to authorise MacArthur's advance beyond the 38th Parallel for the conquest of Korea. On October 8 MacArthur crossed the Parallel. He issued his insolent proclamation for Unconditional Surrender:

> To the Commander-in-Chief, North Korean forces: The early and total defeat and complete destruction of your armed forces and warmaking potential is now inevitable. . . I call upon you . . . forthwith to lay down your arms under such military supervision as I may direct.

On October 15 Truman and MacArthur met to plot the further offensives. On October 19, after seizing Pyongyang, MacArthur boasted: ' The end of the war is in sight '. By November 1 the Korean counter-offensive began, with the first tiny token force of Chinese volunteers; and six American divisions were in retreat.

> We cheered too soon on Korea (*News Chronicle,* November 4.)
>
> Reckless tactics and over-confident strategy, it is now clear, have betrayed the United Nations forces into a major defeat in North Korea. (*The Times,* November 7.)

The second warning, the warning of action, had been given.

Hubris and Nemesis

Still the warning was not taken. With infinite patience the Chinese Government gave renewed opportunity for negotiation. The Chinese Delegation was due to reach Lake Success by the last week in November. There was a lull in military operations. At once the MacArthur Cock began to crow again; the enemy had vanished, the Chinese warnings were ' bluff ', etc. On November 24, the same day that the Chinese Delegation arrived in New York, MacArthur launched his grand offensive to advance to the Chinese border and ' end the war '.

> Tell the boys that when they reach the Yalu they are going home. . . They are going to eat Christmas dinner at home.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A truly Hitler-scale blunder. Within four days his armies were in headlong rout.

A New Era

This action of the Chinese and Korean soldiers changed the course of history. The Western invasion of Asia is reaching its Waterloo. The swollen heads of the War Camp in Tokio, Washington and London had to face a new order of world relationships. They had to face the first glimmering of realisation of the truth that the strength of the Peace Camp today is greater than that of the War Camp, and that if the frenzied leaders of the War Camp choose the path of war, they are choosing the path of suicide. The lesson of the fiasco of the American intervention in China is carried forward to a new stage. For centuries the bandits of imperialism have invaded and ravaged in every continent without check. Today the forces of civilisation and human freedom are proving stronger. The reign of the War Lords is drawing to its close.

Anglo-American Rift

The collapse of MacArthur's offensive brought into the open the deep division of British and American interests in the Far East. This rift had already been revealed, following the victory of Chinese liberation and the defeat of American intervention in China in 1949. Britain, with vast interests at stake in China and Eastern Asia, had proceeded to formal recognition of the Chinese People's Government in January, 1950, while maintaining contact with Chiang Kai-shek. The United States, with no comparable existing possessions, but with strong expansionist aims, continued full backing to Chiang Kai-shek and equipped his bombing and attempted blockade of China. This rift was widened when the United States decided to force the issue by open war measures, and, following the mid-June meeting of Bradley, MacArthur, Dulles and Johnson in Tokio and Bradley's visit to Korea to prepare the offensive, launched the assault on Korea at the end of June, seized Formosa, and ordered its satellites in the United Nations to rubber-stamp its actions. Britain was dragged behind the United States into the war on Korea, sending tardily and grudgingly a small token force, but refused to endorse the seizure of Formosa. MacArthur's defeat and discrediting brought the conflict to a new tension. The most vociferous reaction in the United States demanded new war measures, bombing of Manchuria, blockade of China, possible extension of the war to China; and Truman threatened the atom bomb. British hesitations were de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nounced as 'appeasement' and 'quitting'. In Britain resentment against MacArthur was universal; and open alarm was expressed in all quarters, including official quarters, at the prospect of a war with China or the repercussions of the use of the atom bomb in the Far East. The conflict was intensified by other sharp points of contradiction, especially in the economic sphere, with the American monopolising of raw materials for stockpiling at the expense of the needs of British industry.

Two Trends

In the overwhelming wave of national feeling which swept through all sections in Britain in the first week of December against the reckless American aggressive war policy in the Far East it is necessary to distinguish two trends. Popular opinion (which still saw MacArthur as the enemy, not yet Truman, still less Attlee) was horrified at the prospect of being dragged behind America into a new major war or world war, and at the threat of the use of the atom bomb. Undoubtedly the results of the peace campaign, and the deep impression created by the Stockholm Petition and the controversy around it, contributed to this sharp awareness of the significance and consequences of using the atom bomb. Ruling class opinion was alarmed at the prospect of Britain being involved by American policy in a disastrous war with China, which would liquidate Britain's possessions in China and prospects of trade, open the way to the final collapse of Britain's empire in South East Asia, and swallow up the manpower and resources of the Atlantic Pact countries in the Far East, while the Soviet Union and democratic forces would advance in relative strength in Europe. Hence the desire to switch the concentration of strategy to Europe. The intermingling of these two trends made possible the all-inclusive national character of the outburst, as revealed in the parliamentary debate and major press organs, far beyond a revolt of the left; but revealed at the same time the still considerable degree of confusion of the popular movement. The Government's tactics were directed to utilise the upsurge of popular feeling in order to canalise it into channels corresponding to its own policy. This was illustrated in the letter of the 150 Labour M.P.s, which was at once a significant expression of the deep ferment in the Labour Party, and at the same time a semi-officially encouraged document, with the obvious participation of the leadership, and indeed with the consultation of the Tory leadership.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Attlee Flew

It was in this situation that Attlee decided, in agreement with Churchill and Eden, to fly to meet Truman in Washington. We have here a certain analogy, in new conditions, with Chamberlain's flight to meet Hitler at Berchtesgaden and Munich.

> When the Prime Minister made his announcement in the Commons, the House was in a highly charged state of emotion. One might have supposed that this was the beginning of a new era (*Observer,* December 3).

Indeed, only Gallacher was missing. The *Daily Herald's* streamer on December 4 ' Godspeed to Attlee ' even echoed Attlee's own previous ' Godspeed to Chamberlain '. Then also, twelve years ago, the Government had to face a crisis of popular feeling against the consequences of its own policy of appeasing Hitler. So now the Government had to face a crisis of popular feeling against the consequences of its own policy of appeasing American imperialism. Then also the hopes of the peoples were fixed on the dramatic flight of Chamberlain to bring the solution. So now the hopes of the people were fixed on the dramatic flight of Attlee to bring the solution. But in fact Chamberlain flew, not to express the will of the people, but to make a new deal with Hitler, preparing the way for war. So in fact Attlee flew, not to express the will of the people against the Truman-MacArthur policy, but to make a new deal with Truman-MacArthur for the extension of the war. Attlee flew to Truman, precisely because the anger of the people was rising against the American War Alliance. Attlee flew to Truman, not to express the rising tide of popular feeling against the American Alliance, but to defeat the rising tide of popular feeling, and to save and strengthen the American War Alliance. This was sufficiently expressed in his statements at the airports both on departure and on arrival, when his entire stress was on Anglo-American unity and the danger of any ' wedge ' arising to divide Britain from the American War Lords. In this sense the Washington flight of 1950 was the counterpart of the Munich flight of 1938.

Super-Munich

But Washington went beyond Munich. When Chamberlain returned from Munich, dense crowds thronged the streets to cheer him, because they believed he had brought back peace. When Attlee returned from Washington, there were no cheering crowds to greet him, because the people sensed that he had brought back war. Chamberlain appeased Hitler, sacrificed Czechoslovakia to Hitler's aggression, betrayed Britain's interests to Hitler, and signed the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Munich Pact with Hitler and Mussolini. But Chamberlain did not enter into open war alliance with Hitler. He did not dare to send British soldiers to join in the rape of Czechoslovakia. Attlee, on the other hand, not only appeases the American War Lords, sacrifices Korea to American aggression, and surrenders Britain's interests to Truman, Marshall and MacArthur. Attlee has directly joined in the aggression, agrees at Washington to send further reinforcements of British soldiers to die in Korea, subscribes to the future war plans of American expansion, welcomes an American general to command 'integrated' British and Nazi troops in Europe, and hands a blank cheque to Truman to use the atom bomb when he thinks fit. In short, it has been left to Attlee to play, not merely the rôle of Chamberlain to Truman's Hitler, but the rôle of Mussolini to Truman's Hitler.

Pact of Betrayal

The Washington Agreement has not only betrayed the desires of the people for peace. It also represents a new stage in the surrender of Britain's national interests to American domination. The British people understand that no country is more vitally concerned than Britain to prevent the dropping of the atom bomb. But Attlee at Washington has not only officially abandoned the aim to ban the atom bomb, and officially approved its use in given circumstances beforehand. He has handed over the absolute power of decision to use it to Truman, while Britain will be 'informed' (and his subsequent affirmations of 'complete satisfaction' with this arrangement only underline its sinister character). Thereby Attlee has signed a death-warrant for Britain, for which even Munich affords no parallel.

Extending the War

Attlee at Washington has sanctioned and agreed to the measures for continuing and extending the war in Korea. The hypocritical declaration of readiness to negotiate ('as we have always been ready'—when? when refusing even to hear the North Korean representatives? or when issuing MacArthur's Unconditional Surrender ultimatum?) is rendered transparently insincere by the insistence that negotiation must be on the basis of the United Nations resolutions, i.e., on the basis of submission to the Anglo-American aggression. But the continuance and extension of the war means the extension of war measures to China. Acheson at the Washington Conference made perfectly clear that this was the American plan. On

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China Attlee has accepted American blocking of Chinese representation in the United Nations, under cover of a kind permission to express a verbal difference of opinion. On Formosa Attlee has abandoned even the previous British official stand of refusing to approve the American military aggression against Formosa, and surrendered completely to the American policy that the future of Formosa must be referred to the American caucus 'majority' at the United Nations, i.e., the open repudiation of the Cairo and Potsdam Declarations. But support of the American military aggression against Formosa means war with China. This is the catastrophic path along which the Washington Agreement is seeking to drag Britain.

War Plans in Europe

The most important 'solid decision' of the Washington Conference, in the view of *The Times*, was 'the appointment of a Supreme Commander in Europe'. The parallel formal acceptance of the Soviet proposal for a Four Power Conference to discuss the future of Germany and prevent German rearmament is in practice repudiated by the simultaneous decision to go ahead with West German rearmament without waiting for the outcome of any Conference. Bevin had already surrendered to American pressure in Washington and abandoned the previous British resistance to German rearmament, thereby letting down France. The Washington Agreement coyly conceals German rearmament under the guise of an 'effective integrated force for the defence of Europe' to be placed under an American 'Supreme Commander'. Thus General Eisenhower is to command the mixed battalions of British, French and Nazi comrades-in-arms for the resumption of Hitler's War in the East, in accordance with the aggressive aims so engagingly described by the B.B.C. commentator, Stephen King-Hall, under the heading 'The Third World War':

> As soon as Western Europe is secure, we shall bring the whole of Germany into the Democratic Camp, and that will be the beginning of the end for the Red Empire.
>
> (Stephen King-Hall, National Newsletter, December 7, 1950.)

Such are the pacific aims of the Washington Agreement.

Fight For Peace Now Before It Is Too Late

It will not work. The Washington Agreement will neither solve the deep and growing Anglo-American contradiction, nor will it avail to defeat the rising movement of the peoples for peace. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolt among the satellites has begun. As the *New York Times* noted on December 10:

> It will be a mistake for anyone to think that this was merely an Anglo-American argument. Our Canadian neighbours are more strongly opposed to the Acheson Far Eastern policy now than the British. Western Europe is against us in this argument. There is in short something of a rebellion in the making within the Western Coalition against the past United States policy in the Far East.

But the war plotters work fast. It is necessary for the fight for peace to move faster. We cannot afford to under-estimate the menace which the Washington Agreement represents. The World Peace Congress decisions at Warsaw are a hundred times justified by everything that has taken place in these few critical weeks since Warsaw. These decisions, with their emphasis on stopping the wars in progress, and the war in Korea in the first place, on the basis of withdrawal of foreign troops; on the prevention of rearmament in Germany and Japan; on disarmament; on the resumption of Great Power co-operation to make the United Nations an effective instrument for peace; these decisions point the way to peace. These decisions mark out the plan of campaign and the key objectives for 1951.

December 14, 1950. R.P.D.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES *are 12s. in Britain and 13s. overseas post-free.*

The BOUND VOLUME *for 1950 may be ordered at £1 from book-shops and newsagents; or, if all loose copies are returned in good condition together with 8s. 6d., from The Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3. Ready in February.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WAY TO PEACE

J. D. BERNAL, F.R.S.

THE Warsaw Congress was a major historical event. Coming as it did when the Korean war had reached its crisis it focused the attention of the whole world on the never more urgent problem of the saving of peace. It is part of history but of a history that still lives for the accord that was reached there and the activities that spring from it will endure and spread in an ever widening and more effective activity.

The Second World Congress of the Defenders of Peace came just when it was needed, and that, not by chance. Its summoning followed naturally out of the campaign for the Stockholm appeal. The success of that appeal, far exceeding the hopes of its organisers, had alerted the whole world to the danger of atomic warfare and, at the same time, had shown even to the warmongers the power of the people. From Stockholm onwards, the Peace Movement was bound to become something far greater than and different in character from the first movement of the intellectuals of Wroclaw and even from the great popular rally in Paris. That growth and broadening had not come any too soon. The pace of war preparations was quickening and aggressive war was actually being waged by the Americans in Korea under the pretended auspices, illegally obtained and maintained, of the United Nations. Already, at the very moment that the Congress was held, that war was threatening to spread to China, with the imminent risk of breaking out all over the world.

The outline plans for the Congress were drawn up in the meeting of the Peace Bureau at Prague in August. There it was already clear that the changed world situation called for linking the massive popular protest that had been concentrated on the central issue of the atom bomb, with action on other issues covering the whole field of armaments and coming to grips with the specific and current problem of aggression in Korea. This enlargement marked no change in direction in the movement, for these proposals lay well within its originally proclaimed policy. It did mark a fresh confidence in the possibility of rallying the new, widespread support that had gathered round the Stockholm appeal for a more comprehensive and practical programme for peace. It was at the same meeting that the decision was taken to hold the Second Congress in Britain on the ground that it was there that the determination of the people was most needed to tip the balance between war and peace

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that it was there, also, that the most deliberate and hitherto the most successful efforts had been made to isolate the peace movement and to prevent the people from understanding the issues of war and peace.

How right was that decision, was soon to be shown by the reaction of the British and American Governments. Renewed bans of every kind having failed to stop the preparations, Attlee himself was forced to devote an ill-informed and bad-tempered broadcast speech to denouncing it, thus giving it the best advertisement it had yet had. But there was yet more to come. The Government had hoped, by a series of mean and evasive actions over visas, transport facilities and the like, to force the organisers of the Congress to give it up voluntarily and thus to preserve the hypocritical pretence of permitting free speech. Thanks to the firmness of the supporters of the movement, the Government failed to do this and, in a last moment desperate bid to stop the Congress at Sheffield, so overreached themselves as not only to give to the Congress and the movement enormous publicity but even to earn the censure of Conservatives in the House of Commons. Far more important, however, was the revelation this brought of the enormous fund of popular sympathy for the Congress and its aims. This was shown especially by the people of Sheffield who rallied in thousands to the protest meeting, and by the generous attitude of nearly all the creditors which belied the baleful hopes of ruin with which the millionaire press had greeted the suppression of the Congress. Best of all was the enthusiasm shown by the delegates who, without any preparation, and with the risk, and sometimes the certainty, of dismissal and persecution, nearly all volunteered to transfer to Warsaw.

What the Government had planned as a defeat was turned into a triumph. The brilliantly carried out exodus to Warsaw became of itself of enormous political importance. The action of the Polish Peace Committee in inviting and caring for the delegates, the action of the Polish Government in accepting at two days' notice, without scrutiny or refusal, some two thousand foreigners, including one hundred and thirty journalists, tore a rent in the imaginary iron curtain which it will be very difficult to patch up again. The contrast between the 'free' and the 'totalitarian' countries was too palpable. But the journey and the reception did far more than this. It brought to two hundred delegates from Britain, and to many hundreds from other capitalist and colonial countries, their first real experience of a people's democracy. For many of the delegates, who had never seen anything but hostile accounts of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Democracies, the impression of the appalling damage of war and of the magnificent efforts of the people to build a new civilisation on these ruins, was their most moving and enduring experience of the Congress. And that is no criticism of the speeches or resolutions: for the lessons of war and the needs and hopes of peace could hardly be better learned than from the rubble piles, the new white buildings and the smiles and welcome of the children of Warsaw.

The Warsaw Congress will be remembered as the first completely representative gathering of all the peoples that has ever been. Great as the Paris Congress of 1949 was, and important its discussions and resolutions, that of Warsaw surpassed it in both. This was a tribute to the growth and healthiness of the world movement and, at the same time, to the growing gravity of the situation. Not only were there delegates from far more countries, notably from China and many colonial countries, but the delegations themselves represented very varied political and religious tendencies. Eminent politicians, lawyers and churchmen took a leading part, and so did representatives of peasants and workers. In most countries they had been elected at hundreds of meetings, counting millions of participants, after serious discussion of the problem of peace. The British delegation was encouragingly large and widely based despite all the bans and smear campaigns that had been levelled against participation. Among the delegation of 200 were over 20 professional workers, five Ministers of religions, about 30 housewives, and over 100 Trade Unionists. The delegation came with a message of support from S. O. Davies, the first M.P. with the courage to say what we now know hundreds of others felt about the atom bomb and the need for peace. From other countries in Europe and the rest of the world there was, however, a far greater representation of the churches, particularly Catholic, and of socialist, liberal and even conservative politicians.

The delegates worked with seriousness, determination and a basic optimism. However critical the world situation might appear, they were conscious of the rapidly growing strength of popular opinion for peace and were confident that it would not fail to check war in time. But they knew how much this depended on their own efforts and on how far they could succeed at Warsaw in hammering out a policy that was both workable in itself and capable of winning from the outset active support from millions who had hitherto been apathetic or even hostile. It was a real working congress. Enthusiasm was not lacking—indeed it would have been wrong and unnatural

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have withheld the fullest sympathy and support for the victims of oppression or the defenders of liberty—but that enthusiasm never interfered with the real business of the Congress.

The main objectives of the Congress were to find a way to stop the present wars and reverse the drive to further armament and militarisation. This was brought out clearly in the keynote addresses of Joliot and Nenni. Joliot stressed that

> Progress towards a stable peace must be accomplished in stages, and the successive goals to be achieved must be simple. It is only by stages that the problem of peace will be felt and understood by all, and it is by stages that international confidence will be established, without which no peace is possible.
>
> The gradual growth of such mutual confidence will in turn make it easier to deal with the specific problems.

The stages envisaged were: stopping the Korean war; stopping the arms race; settling the German and Japanese problems;

> It is better to discuss now how to keep Germany disarmed than later to find ourselves fighting once more to take away the arms she has been given.

and making this the basis for a general disarmament programme. Later in his speech, Joliot introduced a theme which was to be much further developed at the Congress—the apparent contradiction between the idea of co-existence of different régimes and the right of popular self-determination.

> To assert that the capitalist system and the socialist system cannot live side by side is, on the one hand, to support the thesis that war is inevitable, and, on the other, reveal that you are prepared to impose on people a dictatorship by force, to prevent them choosing the kind of government they want, and that when citizens want to change a tyrannical régime, you call this 'internal aggression'. . . . The instigators of Truman and Acheson drive people into an armaments race; they make military alliances, they pervert the United Nations . . . to what end? Primarily, in order to prevent any changes in existing economic and political régimes, under the pretext that such changes are 'criminal' and 'subversive'. People are not to be free to decide their own destiny since they are to be told that to wish or to make any change towards a more just régime will become a signal for the outbreak of war.

'It is the task of the peace movement', he continued, 'and one which it has already shown its power to perform, to prevent war and, at the same time, the enslavements of peoples'.

We have confidence that war is not inevitable; that the forces of peace

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are immense; that a peaceful solution exists for every problem; and that the co-existence of different systems is possible.

Nenni, in his speech, expanded the five points of the Prague appeal and added a special plea for saving the United Nations Organisation from itself becoming a tool of the war makers.

> The destruction of the United Nations Organisation has progressed so far, that U.N.O. is today as Pandit Nehru so rightly says, only the supplement to Atlantic Pact. The acceptance of the Acheson Plan leads the United Nations Organisations to even deeper crisis. By weakening the Security Council, created on the basis of unanimity of five Great Powers, and by closing the door to China peace was dealt a dangerous blow. The Congress should mobilise the mighty powers which it represents, to prevent all the attempts on the San Francisco Charter. The United Nations Organisation will regain its prestige and moral authority only when it becomes the real spokesman of the will of the people.

Each of the leading speakers at the Congress tended to confine himself to one or two of the main topics outlined in the opening speeches. Some of these speeches were far more important than is usual even at such conferences, as they contained statements of policy of an almost official character. Indeed, in some respects, the Congress found itself taking over some of the functions of free and friendly discussions between countries, which would be taking place at the United Nations but for the atmosphere of bad manners and petty debating points that the American led majority have spread over Lake Success.

Fadeyev set the tone at Warsaw in a most balanced and statesmanlike speech. The first step, he insisted, to stop the present war, was negotiation.

> We Soviet people, as always in the past, are ready to accept any reasonable proposal, from whatever quarter it may come, if such a proposal would help to strengthen peace throughout the world. We are ready to reach agreement with all the true friends of Peace in the U.S.A., in Great Britain, in Canada, in the Scandinavian countries, with any country in the world independently of any opinions which separate us with regard to our internal structure or our general conception of international life. We are ready to reach agreement on any specific peace proposal; we are ready to seek for the common solution of any problem if this will make it possible for us to wage a common fight for peace.

He urged that this was a prime necessity in the Korean conflict and outlined peaceful steps for a settlement in Korea. The demand for the proper working of the United Nations recurred over and over again in the conference. It was raised quietly and firmly in the speech of Kuo Mo Jo, the leader of the Chinese delegation:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The formation of the United Nations after the Second World War gave hope for peace and security. Today, however, it has been converted into an organ for screening the aggressors in the destruction of peace. We hope that the lost prestige of the United Nations Organisation will be restored, that the Charter will again become more than a series of empty clauses, and that the principle of unanimity of the Big Five in a properly constituted Security Council will again be able to operate.

The delegate of one of the Big Five must be the true representative of the 475,000,000 people of the Republic of China, and not the false representative of a handful of Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries. We cherish the hope that the United Nations will take immediate measures to fulfil these pressing needs. We believe our hope is shared by all people who love peace and oppose wars of aggression.

He brought out the nature of aggression and its relation to the corrupting of governments and the keeping down of the peoples, first by the agents of American capitalism and, when that failed, by their armed forces. It was stressed again, in the most moving terms, by the frail Korean woman delegate Pak Den Ai, after speaking of the terrible and unnecessary sufferings of her people:

Our people having had the bitter experience of colonial servitude are carrying on the struggle for a free and independent life, the struggle for the right to a life of peace and happiness. Our country is ready to make every sacrifice and every effort in the name of its radiant future.

That link between colonialism and aggression was brought out by delegate after delegate, especially from colonial countries. This was, in fact, the major extension of the Prague programme that emerged in the Congress and was taken account of in its resolutions. The Algerian delegate, for instance, showed how impossible it was for his people to accept an indefinite colonial status.

Peace under colonial rule is not peace. Colonialism is a permanent seed of new wars. Enslaved, undernourished, millions of Algerians suffer indescribable misery. You can see them each day along by the roadside, a ragged band, wandering in search of a coin, of non-existent work, of a meagre pittance that they would try to wrest from dogs at a garbage heap. . . . Algerians do not give up. They struggle and they ardently desire the unity of all democratic forces. They know that this day-to-day struggle on national soil and this unity brings them nearer to the time when our people will be masters.

He warned the Congress that no definition of aggression which deprived the peoples of these countries of their right to achieve independence could be acceptable. Speakers commended Litvinov's definition at the League of Nations in 1933, which had already been analysed by the former French Minister, Pierre Cot.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first was that the 1933 draft defined aggression essentially as the armed intervention of one State in the domestic affairs of another. He emphasised that it must be the action of a State; when domestic violence broke out, it was not to be classed as aggression. Not only, he insisted, a people had the right to overthrow its Government by legal means, but they also had the revolutionary right to overthrow it by revolutionary means. He made it clear that was not his dictum, but Abraham Lincoln's, one of the founders of American democracy.

Secondly, he pointed out that the 1933 draft rejects any pretext based on the domestic situation in one country to justify intervention by another —riots and trouble, for instance. When liberty is to be sacrificed, he said, the need to re-establish order is always invoked.

In the same speech he indicated the significance of the support for neutrality expressed in many quarters in the European states.

The supporters of the theory of neutrality prefer, he said, to fight for neutrality rather than allow themselves to be exploited by the American policy of domination and expansion—some of them because they quite simply loved their country; others, though they support capitalism, even of the American kind, because they are uneasy over the mistakes and the irresponsible opportunism of the State Department, which is taking them further than they wish to go. Others again, because they believe that a neutral Western Europe would help to maintain the possibility of that peaceful co-existence of different régimes, which is our fundamental aim.

The 'neutral' attitude, therefore, declared M. Cot, was of extreme importance. A 'neutral' policy would result in several things. First, the denunciation of the Atlantic Pact. Secondly, an inevitable change in policy on the part of the warmongers. They would in fact be forced to change their plans; they could no longer use the Western European platform.

The second step on the way to peace was that of negotiating peace treaties with Germany and Japan, by which Germany would be reunited and both countries demilitarised with guarantees. The argument for this was put forward most forcibly by Fadeyev. Johannes Becher, speaking for the United German delegation at the Congress, repudiated the rearmament proposals.

There are hundreds of examples to demonstrate the spirit of resistance to remilitarisation inspiring the people of Western Germany. Young people and women in particular take every occasion to show their indignation against any prospect of rearmament.

and put his hopes in a new, united Germany.

Is it possible for us, as quickly as possible, to make the German people understand that a great historical chance is being offered them? This chance is our moment to repair our former war crimes by preventing the outbreak, today or tomorrow, of a new criminal war in Europe.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The French people's reaction to the arming of Germany, expressed by M. Sauvage, was equally definite.

> It would be wise to let the American government know that we, the people of France, as well as our neighbours and friends, will never, never accept the rearming of Germany.

The settlement of the German question led directly to the third step, that of disarmament. Here the Congress broke new ground by linking the enforcement of the prohibition of the Atom Bomb with that of control and inspection of a rapid, proportional disarmament. The most significant moment of the Congress was when Fadeyev made the definite proposals for disarmament which were afterwards incorporated into the Congress address to the United Nations. These proposals met all the objections—honest as well as hypocritical—that had been raised against the limited nature of the Stockholm appeal. By linking disarmament control with that of the atom bomb there is no question of unfair advantage to the country with large armed forces. By making inspection by an international body operable on suspicion there can be no question of a one-sided disarmament. By making disarmament proportional for all arms in the first stage, the endless wrangles about equivalence of submarines, aeroplanes, battleships and tanks that were used to wreck the disarmament proposals during the war are by-passed. Here is the basis of a simple and workable scheme for rapid disarmament to below the danger point. A parallel proposal was made by the French delegate, D'Astier de la Vigerie, who added a specific demand for a five-power disarmament conference, which, as a first step, was to agree to halt the arms race. The final step, already foreseen in Fadeyev's speech, was to be that of total disarmament.

Meanwhile much could be done, negatively and positively, to halt the war drive and build a stable peace. First, it is necessary, as Ehrenberg argued in a masterly and moving speech, to stop effectively all propaganda for war. He here expressed his unyielding opposition to war and his acceptance of peace, even with those he thought were its enemies.

> I stand for peace—for peace not only with the America of Howard Fast and Robeson, but also for peace with the America of Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson. . . . We have only one planet to share. It is very spacious, however, and can easily hold the followers of different social systems. 'If you want peace prepare for war'—this dangerous saying of the most militant author of the most militant state is being repeated now by those who prepare for war and want war. It is impossible to prevent war by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accumulating armaments. War can only be prevented by reducing and destroying armaments.

He put forward a resolution for a new law for the protection of peace which was afterwards substantially incorporated in the resolution and which he defended in these terms:

> This resolution is not directed against any particular state or group of states. It protects the interests of all peoples. It does not threaten the freedom of speech and the press, however this freedom may be interpreted, since in all civilised countries there are laws banning incitement to murder . . . Why is it prohibited to rob a shop, but quite possible to call for the invasion of a foreign country? Why is it prohibited to call for the arson of a barn or haystack, but quite possible to call for setting fire to half of the world?
>
> We must concern ourselves not only with the banning of war propaganda, but also with the creation of such moral conditions as are indispensable for peaceful co-existence of different states . . . It is necessary to change the climate of the world—to disperse mutual distrust, to expel from the mind of man the idea of the inevitability and proximity of war. The banning of calls to war, the banning of war propaganda, will restore the lost faith.

This plea against war propaganda was echoed by a number of other speakers, particularly clergy of all faiths. Most notable was that of Father Gaggero from Genoa:

> Everywhere here I have seen and heard Peace: I have seen nothing but works of peace; I have seen in Warsaw a great song of peace—all this while certain leading persons in the world seem to want to prepare new crusades.
>
> Italian Catholics and the majority of the clergy do not want new crusades, because they feel that this is not the way to serve Christ.
>
> No one amongst us is any longer prepared to give their blessing to armaments.
>
> On the contrary, we want to prove that Catholics not only talk peace and pray for peace, but that they also want to construct peace.
>
> Let mankind join hands. We are still divided, but our conscience tells us clearly that we are of one origin, acknowledging a single law, and a duty to march in complete unity to Peace.

The positive steps to be taken, those of restoring international, economic and cultural relations, were also stressed by many speakers, particularly by Academician Volgin; and the breadth of the conception of cultural exchanges was brought out by John Miller, the Scottish miner:

> It is the intention of the miners of the Scottish Area to extend these delegations to other Eastern countries, as we feel by doing so we will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strengthen the bond of friendship between ourselves and the people of the countries we visit, and thereby make a practicable contribution to peace.

It was clear from the whole tone of the Congress, and from the very circumstances of its being transferred from Sheffield to Warsaw, that there was likely to be, outside the United States and its dependencies, much greater possibilities of personal and cultural exchanges particularly in the service of peace. The 'iron curtain' will be shown up as Churchill's smokescreen for the cold war.

As the Congress went on, the issues of a successful policy for peace became clearer and commanded almost universal assent. This made all the easier the work of the commissions that were drafting the final resolutions. We had to remember all the time, however, that the work and, indeed, the whole congress, would be useless unless the programme we put forward drew to us the support of many who had hitherto been indifferent or opposed to us. That this was beginning to happen was shown by the composition of the Congress itself and speeches from such countries as Switzerland, Holland and Scandinavia showed how rapidly the tide was turning.

Pastor Sten Heglor mentioned in his speech how important sections of Swedish opinion, including the leading Social-Democrat, George Branting, were now supporting the peace movement.

The presence of the United States delegation bore witness to an active peace movement that survives and grows in spite of the most violent persecution. The Rev. Mr. Uphaus, in his speech as leader of the delegation, expressed his faith in the American people:

> The picture drawn so far has been discouraging, but let me assure you there are many grounds for hope. Millions of Americans, like the peoples of other lands, long for peace and the wide-spread sentiment for peace is a foundation on which we can and must build. Three million signed the Stockholm Peace Declaration and more than a million others have subscribed to other peace appeals. Our fourteen million Negroes constitute a powerful force for Peace.

D'Astier de la Vigerie, Progressive Republican, made a powerful plea for the widening of the movement.

> Our position remains the same: to take into consideration all proposals from any who seek the path of peace, to seek with them together a basis for common action, however limited it may be, in order to preserve Peace.

I tried in my own speech to indicate some of the ways in which the movement can be broadened in Britain: how near, indeed, we have come to the ideals of Pacifists, Liberals, Socialists and of all genuine patriots while persevering in the advocacy of a practicable policy for peace, that was first discussed at Paris and is continually

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being brought into relation with the rapid movement of world events.

It would be impossible to go further to summarise the three hundred speeches given at the Congress: though with such a wide range of peoples and occupations taking part, there was something important to be learned from each of them. Not all, by any means were in accord with every aspect of the general policy of the Congress, but all, with one exception, that of Mr. Rogge, agreed that the road to peace lay through negotiation, disarmament and respect for the rights of colonial peoples. Of course, had the Labour Party allowed its members to take part, we would have had a livelier debate, but not such a different one, for all the speakers from capitalist countries went to the Congress fully aware of the views of those who would not or could not come, and often made themselves the representatives of them.

This was reflected especially in the Congress resolution prepared by commissions where there were no speeches, but vigorous discussion and careful drafting. The major resolution of the Congress is contained in the Address to the United Nations. Its nine points follow, though not in the same order, the steps on the road to peace already described. They are, first and foremost (1) the stopping of the war in Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign troops, with a final settlement in accordance with the will of the Korean people, under the supervision of a Security Council in which the Chinese Peoples' Republic takes its rightful place, and which should also put an end to foreign intervention in Taiwan (Formosa) and Viet Nam. This is coupled with a special resolution (6) citing the inhuman conduct of the war, with the sufferings inflicted on the civil populations, as a crime against humanity, and bringing into court the question of the responsibility of General MacArthur. Two further resolutions (3) and (4) are concerned with the rights of colonial peoples and the fallacy of treating the vindications of such rights as acts of aggression. The next main resolution (2) is directed against the illegal re-armament of Germany and Japan and demands negotiation of peace treaties with them and the withdrawal of foreign troops.

The third and central resolution (7) deals with the joint question of prohibition of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction and with the rapid reduction of armaments under inspection and control, by a Security Council organisation. This, as has already been pointed out, is a scheme both practicable and fair to all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers. The only grounds for rejecting it are the intention of building up aggressive armaments which are destined for a third world war. To help the easing off of the Cold War, there are three more resolutions: one (5), making war propaganda illegal; (8) which asks for a resumption of economic and (9) for cultural relations between the nations. In addition to the address were a number of more detailed resolutions which make certain of its points clearer. Of a different character, however, and of much greater importance was the resolution of the Organisation Commission which resulted in the setting up of a World Peace Council. This body, far more widely representative than any that has existed before, will have the general responsibility, not only of giving general direction to the Movement of the Defenders of Peace but will also act as a responsible tribunal giving expression to the opinions of the peoples of the world on the issues of peace and war.

The great achievement of the Congress is that it proposes for the first time a coherent and practicable peace policy and one which, when understood, should be acceptable to all men of goodwill whatever their politics. It will be the first task of the movement in every country to see that it is understood to ensure that everyone learns that there is a way to peace and that he has a responsibility to see that it is followed. There will be the problem of clearing up honest misunderstandings and discussing modifications which do not weaken the central conditions of negotiation, disarmament, the rights of colonial peoples and the peaceful coexistence of different régimes. This plan offers peace without giving advantage to one side or another in any 'cold war'. Naturally, it will not appeal to those who want to blot out the Soviet Union, Red China and all its works, but more and more people are seeing in spite of the press the impossibility, as well as the immorality, of attempting to do this. Nevertheless, those who do think so, like General MacArthur, are still in positions of power, with timid politicians like Mr. Attlee to do their bidding. How dangerous this can be has been shown by the events which occurred in the three weeks after the Congress, when an atomic war nearly broke out—and still may do so at any moment.

It was in this crisis that the soundness of the judgments of the Peace Movement and the value of its work were fully justified. The British people in particular were not caught unprepared. The instantaneous and overwhelming protest against the threat of Mr. Truman to use the atom bomb, forced him to abandon the idea

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1921 THIRT

DURING this year LABOUR MONTHLY reaches an important anniversary. In July, 1921, this magazine appeared for the first time. By July, 1951, it will have appeared for thirty years without a break—for a whole generation.

OUR CIRCULATION

From its early beginnings, the Magazine of International Labour has reached an important position, unequalled by any similar Marxist journal in the English tongue. It is subscribed for and sold to thousands of overseas readers in over 55 countries; at home it exercises a powerful influence on the thinking and action of the best sections of the Labour Movement.

SINCE 1939 THE CIRCULATION HAS MORE THAN DOUBLED

This is a remarkable achievement for a 1s. political monthly, despite all the wartime and post-war difficulties. Moreover, during the last two years, when—as every publisher knows—circulation trends have headed steeply downward, LABOUR MONTHLY *has maintained, and latterly* **increased,** *its circulation. To illustrate this with comparative net paid sales:*

January, 1939	**7,206**
January, 1950	**13,572**
December, 1950 (incomplete)	**14,760**

It is because of this achievement in a period of difficulties (some production costs having more than doubled) that we know there is a basis for **a much greater circulation still.**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

YEARS 1951

EXPERIENCE in the past has taught us that any drive for circulation always originates with our readers—a fact which is significant enough in itself. Exactly this has been developing during the last six months of 1950, when nearly 5,000 more copies were sold than in the first half of the year.

It would be a splendid way for each reader to **begin the New Year by winning a new reader.** *We shall do all we can on our part to co-operate in helping readers to extend this drive.*

OUR PLANS

Among our many plans, as we approach our Thirty Years' celebration in July, is the 1951 series of LABOUR MONTHLY PAMPHLETS, *beginning with No. 1,* THE SHAW MEMORIAL PAMPHLET. *How telling such pamphlets can be in introducing a new wide range of readers to* LABOUR MONTHLY *can be seen from our experience with D. N. Pritt's famous* LIGHT ON KOREA *(sold out at 45,000), and even the comparatively expensive* KOREA HANDBOOK *(which has long since overtopped the print of 3,000 and is fast nearing the limits of the first reprint).*

We shall begin at once to help readers to exchange their circulation-raising suggestions, printing one each month. Circulation Raiser No. 1 will be found on the cover.

Finally, we offer our warmest

NEW YEAR GREETINGS

to all readers, old and new.

EDITORIAL BOARD

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the time being and sent Mr. Attlee scuttling across the Atlantic to find a form of words with which to pacify the revulsion of feeling among the British people. The petition campaign certainly played its part in this. However effective Labour discipline and loyalty or the sneers of the press were in preventing people from supporting the petition, they could not prevent people from agreeing with it in their hearts and coming out openly when the time came. It remains to be seen how far the Attlee-Truman conversations and the far more important diplomatic and military actions that may come from them, will satisfy this new and insurgent public opinion. Insofar as the peace movement has done, and is doing, its job, the people should be wary enough not to be deceived into further wars under the pretext of defending peace. The main result of the meeting has indeed been to accelerate activities along the road to war and stop altogether those leading to peace. The refusal of the United States, with the polite but ineffective dissent of Mr. Attlee, to accord the Republic of China its rights in the United Nations, is preventing any reasonable solution of the Korean war and threatens to spread it further. The arming of Germany and Japan creates each a new focus of war. Rearmament schemes threaten to ruin national economies and to diminish to the vanishing point the provision of what are now scathingly referred to as 'essential civilian needs'. The cutting off of the last links of trade with China and the Peoples' Democracies, breaks the world economically into two. There is little pretence now that all this is not intended for war, if it is not in fact already war. The disasters in Korea have taught these people nothing. No armies that can be raised by all the Atlantic powers can conquer the territories of countries in which the people themselves are building their own economies and culture. They can destroy blindly but they cannot win by all the devilries of atomic, hydrogen or bacterial war. The game is up, and ordinary sensible people are beginning to see it.

Yet the task that faces the peace movement now is an immense and formidable one; it is to get this gigantic engine which is steamed up and heading for war, on to the other track that leads to peace. Before it can go forward along that track, it has first to be stopped and reversed. But we have the knowledge and are beginning to have the power to do this. The bland front of opposition, blind and deaf to any sight or sound of peace, has broken under the first serious shocks of impending war. More and more people are coming to see that the policy of 'cold war' against the Soviet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union which the Government have followed for the past six years simply will not work. They are looking now for any workable alternative. Policies which are in the main those of the World Movement of the Defenders of Peace, are being taken up and advanced in hundreds of factories and churches, they are being canvassed inside the Labour and even the Conservative parties. This movement is not organised: it will be difficult to organise it as long as the suspicions and fears which years of abuse and misrepresentation have engendered, have not been wiped out by new experience and by the rapid course of events. It will consequently at first be easy to split its new supporters, to dissipate their efforts, to buy them off by specious promises. It is then, especially, that the organisation of the defenders of peace must come into action. With the clear knowledge of the issues, with the coherent peace policy of the Warsaw Congress, it should be able to rally uncertain and faltering opinions. There is no need to stress one definite political line; indeed the whole spirit of Warsaw was against any such insistence. The criterion—the only criterion—should be is this for war or for peace? There is, of course, enormous scope for peace activities, in homes and streets, in factories and mines; the women and the youth, always so energetic in the peace movement, will redouble their efforts. As a movement, we want adherents who are prepared individually to devote themselves as never before to the work of peace. Even more, however, we need allies: people also striving for peace in their own way. We want to work with them in the measure they will work with us. They bring to the general movement new people, new organisations, which we might not be able to reach. We can give them the experience and the support of a great world movement comprising more than one quarter of all the peoples of the world. We can show them that they are not alone and that our programme for peace is not merely what we would like to see done, but what can actually be done, though more easily the more we can get to help with it. I am convinced that we will not be disappointed. For if there is one thing that has emerged clearly from the first stages of the present crisis, it is that the British people do not want war, especially war with China, and war in which the atom bomb is used. It is the clear and forcible expression of that feeling that must force the British Government to keep out of war. It is by so doing that we can absolutely prevent its outbreak, for the U.S. cannot move without

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain, and, in spite of the subservience of Mr. Attlee, is as much in need of Britain economically as Britain is in need of U.S.A.

The struggle to defend peace—the struggle to save it before it is too late—is now not merely the most important task of our day, it is the task on which all others depend. If we fail there, all other struggles for education, for health, for better living, will fail too. That is the lesson that hard experience is teaching, but to benefit from that lesson, to spread that benefit widely, we need more. We need the understanding of the forces of peace and war in the world so that we can know in any particular phase of the struggle what has to be done and how to gain the support of others to ensure that it is done. That is the lesson of Warsaw: one that we must carry with us for the days to come.

(THE TEXT OF THE WARSAW PEACE POINTS WILL BE FOUND ON PAGES 41-42.)

LABOUR MONTHLY PAMPHLETS 1951 SERIES

This article by Professor Bernal will shortly be appearing with additions in the 'Labour Monthly' Pamphlets 1951 Series. Price 6d. (See back page). Order Now, from all bookshops, newsagents, or from Dept. M., 134 Ballards Lane, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S. IMPERIALISM
The most dangerous enemy of the Chinese People

TEH KAO

MANY Chinese workers, peasants and veterans have volunteered to go to Korea to help the Korean people fight the imperialists. With their own bitter experiences and those passed down from their fathers and grandfathers, these patriots have sensed in the American armed intervention in Korea a direct threat to the security of their motherland. Since the United States launched war on the Korean people many articles written by well-known historians, professors and journalists have appeared in Chinese newspapers, delineating the historical background of U.S. imperialist designs upon China.

American imperialism has stepped into the shoes of Japanese imperialism, this is the unanimous conclusion of all Chinese writers. It is now pursuing the course which Japanese militarists travelled for fifty years until 1945.

American aggression against China actually dates from the outbreak of the Opium War, more than a hundred years ago. The outstanding characteristic of American policy towards China in its early stage is that it endeavoured to achieve its rapacious aims by taking advantage of others' aggression, thus cunningly escaping any responsibility for its nefarious acts. This was followed by competition with other powers and, finally, unconcealed ambition to conquer the entire Chinese nation.

When the Opium War broke out in 1840, America ordered one of its fleets under the command of Commodore Lawrence Kearny to the aid of the British imperialist troops. It fished in the troubled waters and forced the signing of the Cushing Treaty in 1844. Handiwork of the then U.S. plenipotentiary deputy to China, Caleb Cushing, this treaty constitutes the first treaty of inequality imposed upon China, granting to America extraterritorial rights and other prerogatives. The Chinese people can never forget that it is America which has done the greatest harm to their country by seizing from it extraterritorial rights, extraterritoriality which later proved to be the common ' pound of flesh ' sought by all other imperialist powers.

At the time of the Taiping Revolutionary Movement, a peasant revolution that broke out in 1850, American imperialism ardently

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

joined the reactionary Manchu government in armed suppression. Under the guise of mediator, the United States of America supported the invasion of Tientsin and Peking by the joint Franco-British forces in the years 1857-1860. It grabbed from the incompetent and rotten Manchu government the right of inland navigation.

As American imperialism emerged later than the other imperialists who had already partitioned China into different spheres of influence, in 1899 it advocated the 'Open Door' policy which recognised all the colonial rights and 'acquired interests' in China of all the other imperialist countries, and demanded their 'opening' by America so that it might also have 'an equal share in the profits'. In 1900, the United States of America participated in the occupation of Peking by the joint forces of eight powers. These aggressors robbed the people of everything valuable, burnt buildings and raped women. Through the subsequent 'Boxer Indemnity' they extracted 450 million ounces of gold from the Chinese people. The U.S.A. also got the right to garrison troops in Peking and other cities.

The 1911 Revolution again found the United States fervently boosting warlord Yuan Shih-kai, then the enemy of the revolutionary government headed by Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

The Great Revolution in 1925-1927 was no exception to U.S. intervention. U.S. warships co-operated with the British Navy in bombarding Nanking in order to force Chiang Kai-shek to betray the people's revolution. The bombardment resulted in more than 2,000 civilian casualties—and Chiang turned over to the imperialists. The Chinese Communist Party, however, continued to lead the national liberation movement in the rural area. The U.S.A. supplied numerous dollars, airplanes and military advisers to Chiang Kai-shek for his rabid attacks on the revolutionary Red Army of Workers and Peasants.

At the moment when the entire Chinese people was resisting the Japanese invader with all its might during the eight-year Anti-Japanese War, the U.S.A. supplied quantities of war material to Japan. According to statistics available, the potential war material which American imperialism exported to Japan in 1938 reached as high as 92 per cent. of Japan's total war material consumption. On the eve of the Pearl Harbour incident, American scrap iron shipped to Japan reached 70 per cent. of the total scrap iron import of that country. Also, in this period, the United States abetted the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chinese national traitor Chiang Kai-shek in his hysterical anti-Communist campaigns.

When Japan surrendered, most of the Kuomintang armies were crouching in the south-west corner of China, while the vast mainland was under the effective control of the people's liberation forces led by the Chinese Communist Party. In order to help the Kuomintang Government back to its despotic rule, the U.S.A. dispatched its forces to infiltrate into Peking, Tientsin, Shanghai and Tsingtao and airlifted Kuomintang troops into other cities. Up to July, 1946, the U.S. marine corps alone, in China, amounted to 90,000. Within three years after Japan's surrender, the U.S. Government had equipped 117 Kuomintang divisions and aided the Kuomintang Government with 4,346,000,000 U.S. dollars. In return, it had gained many prerogatives in China from the hands of the traitorous rulers. The most notorious was the so-called ' Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation', which opened all China's territory and enterprises to the United States. Without American aid, Chiang Kai-shek could not have launched his full-scale offensive against the liberated areas in 1946, massacring millions of Chinese people.

The Chinese people, however, have won a formidable victory over the U.S.-supported Chiang Kai-shek forces. This has stung the U.S. imperialists to mad fury, which is one of the reasons why the American Government instigated the war against Korea. In the aggressive war against Korea the U.S. added finishing touches to its naked replacement of Japanese imperialism as the most dangerous enemy of the Chinese and Asian peoples.

As the United States invaded Korea, it was tightening up a cordon of encirclement round China by occupying Taiwan and intervening in the Philippines and Viet Nam.

Despite the repeated warnings of the Chinese people, U.S. planes frequently invaded Chinese territorial air, killing and wounding people. U.S. warships bombarded and searched a Chinese merchantman. American troops crossed the 38th Parallel in Korea and rolled northward towards the boundary of China.

One may wonder why the United States mobilised practically all its forces in the Far East to occupy such a small country as Korea. Its purpose is only too evident: a spring-board or a vanguard base for invading continental China and the Soviet Union. It will be recalled that in April, 1949, the United States and Syngman Rhee drafted a treaty, the seventh article of which ran thus:

. . . In his turn, the President of the Korean Republic . . . undertakes to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand over the development of the natural resources of Manchuria and other parts of Eastern China to the joint administration of the United States and Korea.

History has convinced the world that he who wants to rule Korea must have the ultimate ambition of conquering China.

The Chinese people have learnt much from experience in the past one hundred years of struggle against imperialism. They are well aware of the aggressive designs of the United States and cannot sit idly. A spontaneous 'Support our Korean friends against the American imperialists to protect our homes and fatherland' movement has swept like wildfire across the country. The Chinese people feel absolutely sure that they will crush U.S. imperialism as they did the Japanese invaders.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

TRIAL OF THE COMMUNISTS

'IT was a fair trial'. It is true the judge happened to be an ex-Tory Member of Parliament, who had been unseated by a Labour representative; but this was an accident, and made no difference to his complete freedom from class outlook. It is true the Conservative Party openly dictated the prosecution, and the Home Secretary predicted the sentence beforehand; but these were, as *The Times* correctly pointed out, 'indiscretions', and should not be allowed to create a wrong impression. It is true the jury did not apparently contain a single Labour representative, despite Labour now constituting a third of the electorate; but this was mere chance of the ballot and should only be treated as such. 'The jury', declared *The Times* with regard to them, 'may be taken to represent the normal citizens of this country'. It is true that a statistically correct representation of the 'normal citizens of this country' should, as a mere matter of arithmetic, contain at least nine or ten labourers and operatives out of the twelve; but this is a sordid and scientific view, which actually treats common people as existing, and forgets that for *The Times* and all right thinking people 'the normal citizens of this country' consist of one-tenth of the population. Finally, the defendants were actually allowed to speak for a number of hours before their sentence without being clubbed on the head for it. It is true that every time they wished to make a single reference to any really important facts, such as the politics of the case, the rôle of the Conservative Party, the secret police, the Fascist outrages, and the illegal arming and utterances of their prosecutors, they were rapidly stopped by the judge with the comment that such matters were 'irrelevant'; but this was not an exhibition of class bias, but purely fidelity to the Law.

From the *Notes of the Month*, January, 1926.
Written in Prison de Forest, Brussels.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

D. A. MICHAELSON

RECENTLY the movement has been looking with anxiety at the position of hard-won trade union rights, customs and practices. In particular they have witnessed the attack on the right to strike, of which the use of the carefully preserved wartime measure Order 1305 against the gasmen was a clear-cut and carefully timed demonstration.

Ten of the striking gas workers—described by counsel for the Director of Public Prosecutions as 'men of perfectly good character'—were each sentenced to one month's imprisonment on October 5, 1950. The prosecution was undertaken at the height of the London gas strike, to quote the Parliamentary Correspondent of *The Times* (October 6, 1950) 'on the sole responsibility of the Attorney-General' who had 'consulted his ministerial colleagues before making the decision'. The legal machinery selected on this occasion was—to give it its full and resounding title—*The Conditions of Employment and National Arbitration Order, 1940* (*Statutory Rule and Order No. 1305*), under *Defence Regulation 57AA* (*Emergency Powers Acts*). This lays it down that a strike, or lockout, is illegal unless the dispute has been reported to the Minister of Labour and he has not referred it within 21 days for settlement to the usual negotiating procedure for certain industries, to a Court of Inquiry or to the National Arbitration Tribunal.

The shock this caused the trade union movement was apparent during the month which elapsed before the men's appeal was heard from the sentence of Sir Lawrence Dunne (Chief Metropolitan magistrate), passed

> to show those who are tempted in the future the serious view the court will and must continue to take . . . and to bring before you and your fellows the seriousness of any further illegal strike.
>
> (*The Times*, October 6, 1950.)

Before the London Sessions Appeals Committee on November 22, Mr. Christmas Humphreys for the Director of Public Prosecutions said

> that when before the Chief Magistrate he told him that the men must have been aware of what was the law. He would now modify that to some extent as the result of information which he had since received.
>
> (*The Times*, November 22, 1950.)

The Chairman, Mr. Anthony Hawke, giving the Appeals Com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittee's decision, said that it had appeared before the Magistrate that the men had

> with full knowledge of the law and its consequences, deliberately set at defiance and took the law into their own hands. If that was the true picture of the nature of the offences committed then it would have been quite impossible for the committee to say that the sentences of one month's imprisonment were in any way excessive. They were now invited by the counsel for the respondents to take a different view, as although they were aware they had not adopted the proper conciliation machinery, they were unaware they were offending against the criminal law. The prosecution has now apparently served its purpose as everybody now knew that to take the action these men did would be an offence against the criminal law. (*ibid.*)

With all the majesty of the law, he allowed the appeal and varied the sentence to a mere fine of £50 each.

These brief extracts bring out the points clearly enough: the mass protest movement aroused by the prison sentences; the 'information since received' by the Office of Public Prosecutions leading to instructions 'to modify' the statement; the vindication of the majesty and impartiality of the law; and the warning sent forth that to strike ('illegally', of course) in Britain is a criminal offence which will certainly mean a gaol sentence in future.

How has this extraordinary situation come about? This wartime measure, the prosecution was at pains to point out, was continued with the consent of the trade union movement. As Mr. Humphreys remarked:

> For 10 years the whole trade union movement had known of and apparently approved.

The learned gentleman was misdirected on this point. Resolutions calling for the end of 1305 have been debated at the Trades Union Congress each year since 1945. This year the vote was 2,423,000 against and 5,166,000 for. However, no delegate imagined he was voting to send leading trade unionists to gaol. The main point made was that the small unions found 1305 useful in compelling employers to observe trade union conditions. It was not made clear in the T.U.C. debate that Part III of the Wages Council Act, 1945 (8 and 9 Geo. 6. Ch. 17), would cover the section of 1305 which lays down the observance of minimum conditions. It is, in fact, substantially a reprint of the section of 1305 entitled 'Recognised terms and conditions of employment'. The spokesman of the Ministry of Labour has confirmed that Part III of the Act has general application, and is not limited to industries with Wages Councils.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is important to note the circumstances of the gasworkers' dispute. It arose from a claim for 4½d. per hour increase by some 1,500 maintenance men employed by the North Thames Gas Board. They are employed on heavy and arduous work, servicing the complicated apparatus of pumps, boilers, retorts and conveyors. It is an extremely dirty job, much of it done in the open. The men claim that workers with comparable skill in general engineering can earn very much more than they do. Process workers in the gas industry on a bonus system can—and do—earn more than skilled men, who are expected to maintain ancient worn-out equipment, frequently in a foul gassy atmosphere. The claim was submitted in November, 1948, and since nothing substantial had happened, the men met in August this year and gave a month's notice of their intention to take action failing satisfaction on the 4½d. claim. The defence counsel made the point that the men did not take action until more than the statutory 21 days had elapsed; but they gave the notice to their unions of a dispute, and not to the Minister. The point then arises if men give notice of a dispute to the unions, and the Minister is not informed, who is at fault? If it is argued that the men must notify the Minister, the resulting chaos can be imagined, with different groups of workers giving notice of strike action direct while union bodies are carrying on negotiations. In this case the unions concerned accepted a 1½d. per hour, and when the men heard the terms they struck. The wartime record of 1305 should also be noted: 109 cases involving the prosecution of 6,281 workers and two employers, a reminder of the impartial character of the Order. An impressive solidarity campaign developed around the men, to end 1305, and to defend the right to strike. A delegate conference was called at very short notice in the Beaver Hall, London, on November 11, which was a striking tribute to the depth of feeling on the issue. 389 delegates attended representing 194,000 London Trade Unionists, nine District Committees, 161 Trade Union Branches, five Trades Councils, and many of the most important shop stewards' committees were represented, e.g., Fords, de Havillands, S. Smith, Kelsey Hayes, Barking, Battersea and Croydon Power Stations. A committee of 20 was elected to launch a National Campaign for the aim set out in the resolution adopted unanimously:

1. Acquittal of the ten Gasworkers.
2. Ending Order 1305.
3. Disbanding of all police organisations set up to spy on Trade Unionists.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The resolution described the prosecution ' as a menace to our most vital freedom, the right to strike ', and went on to declare that

> The question ' Are you in favour of ending Order 1305?' will be put to every trade union official, every candidate for office and every M.P.

Delegates were pledged to work for trade union support for these objectives. The committee sent out an appeal directed particularly to Shop Stewards ' who are in the front line ' in this fight, as victimisation can only be fought effectively by action, appealing for funds to launch a National Campaign. A fully representative Committee, it plans to hold a National Conference in London early in the New Year. Provincial conferences are also under way, and the committee will no doubt take steps to develop a solidarity campaign if any other workers are prosecuted under the Order.

The right to strike was not handed to us by any Labour Minister; it cannot be taken away from us by any product of Eton or Winchester, more familiar with the right wines to go with the fish course than the bitter realities of the class struggle. It was only after many hard years of battles and sacrifices that the legal right to strike was won. It will not be given up. The reason for the emerging of the iron fist from the velvet glove is clear. The defeat of the wage freeze at the T.U.C. demonstrated the inability of the right-wing leadership to hold back the rising struggle against higher prices to maintain real wages. The arms drive means vicious attacks on living standards, and the threat of imprisonment is held over the heads of any workers determined to resist attacks. How wrong they are is shown by the strike of 1,000 coachbuilders at Duples, Hendon. After seven weeks on strike only 16 voted to accept terms for a resumption recommended by Union officials. Thousands of staunch Labour Party workers were amazed at the use of Order 1305. Factories which had not been heard from in years on general topics passed resolutions in the strongest terms. As Mr. Sidney Silverman, M.P., told the Labour Party Conference, ' If you lose the confidence of the workers in the factories, you won't regain it in the Police Courts '.

Two roads open up before the Labour Party. The road of struggle against fresh burdens on the workers, the fight to end capitalism instead of trying to patch up the rotten fabric; or the road of German Social-Democracy, increasing the use of the police and the courts to try to stifle resistance to capitalist attacks, the road of Noske and Scheideman, the butchers of the German working class. The ' Middle Way ' smokescreen is clearing; the ugly reality is emerging.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GROWING REVOLT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

C. ALLEN

THE Middle East is today one of the key strategic areas in the British Empire. Since the 'cold war' has begun it has assumed great additional importance, for it is the only area which has a land border with key areas of the Soviet Union, and is, therefore, very much in the forefront of American and British war planning. Whilst America is a recent arrival in the Middle East, with a powerful foothold in Turkey, Saudi Arabia and, to a certain degree, Persia, the rest of the Middle East is *predominantly* a British sphere. A recent survey of the Middle East, published in 1950 by the semi-official Royal Institute of International Affairs, says:

> The chief importance of the Middle East in world affairs is strategic. . . The region constitutes a land bridge between three continents. Possession of it by a predominant Sea-Power makes it possible to limit the scope of a military conqueror by confining the area of his conquest to a single continent, his own. (p.3.)

Most of the Middle East is formally 'independent'. But these so-called 'independent' countries, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Jordan, are occupied by British troops and air bases. Hence their real status is that of semi-colonies. Since 1882 the British have been in military occupation of Egypt. Innumerable promises were made by various British governments to withdraw the troops: 68 years later they are there in greater force than ever. From old Joe Chamberlain the jingo down to 'socialist' Attlee, British statesmen have gone on record stating: 'As soon as order is restored we will withdraw' (Chamberlain in 1882). For 68 years Egypt has been, and is, in a state of 'chaos'. *The Times* in a military survey of Egypt wrote cynically:

> The whole of the Suez Canal Zone is virtually a built-up area dotted with army camps and air fields which are linked by good roads. . . Altogether there are more than a dozen R.A.F. establishments in the Canal Zone alone. (December 20, 1949.)

Two days later the writer returned to explain what the British military and R.A.F. are doing there:

> In peace-time the main tasks of the R.A.F. Command are to safeguard British interests throughout the Middle East; to provide and maintain staging posts along the Empire Air routes; and *to keep order.* (December 22, 1949. My italics, C.A.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How order is being kept will be shown later. In addition to strategic bases there are many raw materials exploited by the British, and with very cheap labour, too. Take oil. British interests control most of the Middle Eastern Oil (with the exception of the purely American concern in Saudi Arabia) and the figures of oil production and oil profits are edifying.

Oil from the Middle East (000 metric tons)

	1938	1945	1946	1947	1948
Iran	10,359	17,000	19,497	20,418	25,000
Iraq	4,364	4,712	4,700	4,478	3,150
Egypt ..	223	1,347	1,280	1,332	1,880
Kuwait ..	—	—	800	2,200	6,400
Bahrein ..	1,137	1,000	1,100	1,300	1,500

As a result of the second world war the British Government was forced to sell over forty per cent. of the oil shares in Iraq to the U.S.A. Bahrein's oil is practically controlled by the Americans. During 1948 the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. made profits of over seventy million pounds, and in 1949 over sixty-five million pounds. (*The Economist Record of Statistics, 1950.*)

And labour in the Middle East is very, very cheap for the monopolies. The authoritative American journal *Middle East Economic Service* for August, 1950, published the latest available figures (for 1945) for wages for Egyptian workers, as £4 15s. 10d. per month. Iraqui workers are even worse paid. The journal then goes on to say that conditions in 1950 are even worse than in 1945.

> Nominal wages are now higher in local currency, but real wages have declined considerably. The increase in wages did not keep pace with the rising prices and cost of living.*

In addition to oil, British monopolies control finance, insurance, the cotton market, shipping, and much else in the Middle East.

We have seen that in the Suez Canal Zone there are more than a dozen R.A.F. establishments. It is the same story with Cyprus, Iraq, Jordan, Aden and the small numerous Arabian principalities.† Officially there are ten thousand British troops in the Canal Zone, but unofficially the figure was given as over 25,000. The British Government has not published any detailed figures since 1948. 'It is now felt that, in the present state of world affairs, at least, the open publication of the proposed and actual expenditure at particu-

---

**Middle East Economic Service* (Vol. IV., No. 2, p. 12.)

† *ibid.*, p. 106, 109, 111, 113-117, 119, 238, 272 *et passim.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lar stations is highly undesirable '. (*Second Report from the Select Committee on Estimates,* Session 1948-49. *The Defence Estimates,* February, 1949, p. 10.)

A real, and not an imaginary, iron curtain hangs over the whole of the Middle East. Martial law seems to be the rule rather than the exception. In Iraq, for example, there are over fifteen thousand people in prison for political offences. In Egypt thousands are languishing in gaol. Trade Unions are proscribed. Strikes are illegal. The Communist Party is banned. To keep ' law and order ' the British not only rely on their troops, but have powerful stooges to enforce ' law and order ' and to act as British gendarmes. The most corrupt section of the ruling class 'in power' in the Middle East is the landed aristocracy and the Kings.

Recently a glimpse was given of the corruption of the Egyptian ruling class. The army was sent to fight in Palestine badly equipped, while some high-ups made enormous profits. The high-ups are even members of Farouk's Court. The Government was trying to hush-hush the scandal. Leading Army Officers were put on the pension list. Some of the more subtle leaders of the bourgeoisie wanted to have a palace revolution, an attempt ' to eliminate the Rasputins to save the régime '. (*Moyen-Orient,* Paris, October—November, 1950, p. 11.)

Apart from the indescribable corruption of the ruling class, the plight of the masses is appalling. The health of the Egyptian people is so undermined that out of every 17 persons called up for the army, 16 were found unfit on medical grounds. (*The Times,* September 29, 1950, article 'Britain and Egypt'.) The mortality rate, 168 per 1,000 births, is amongst the highest in the world. Bilharzia has affected nearly ninety per cent. of the rural population.

> The poor live in hovels and toil for a pittance under the burning sun, with shocking death-rates and disease-rates. (Scrutator in *Sunday Times,* January 8, 1950.)

This applies right through the Middle East. These are the benefits of direct British occupation.

Dissatisfaction with the corrupt régimes of the Middle East is growing fast, and the National Liberation Movement is showing everywhere signs of lively activity. The peoples know who are their real enemies. The *Middle East Survey* speaks of the Middle East as ' a world ripe for social revolution ' and says of the Egyptian people that they are

> preoccupied by the prospect that these foreign military establishments—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which seemed always to grow and never to lessen—might perhaps never leave the country at all. (p. 165.)

But the Egyptian people are prepared to fight and force British imperialism to quit. Even the corrupt régime of Farouk and Nahas Pasha was forced to voice the sentiments of the people by demanding British evacuation of the Suez Canal Zone, the abrogation of the imposed 1936 Treaty and the unification of the Nile Valley. Whatever the motives that prompted Nahas Pasha to state these demands now, the mere fact is that no Egyptian Government, however reactionary, can agree to the terms of the 1936 Treaty. Such is the deep feeling of the Egyptian people. Soon after Nahas Pasha made the speech over twelve thousand Egyptian students marched demanding the British to leave Egypt. While Farouk, and even Nahas Pasha, may have uttered these demands as a kind of safety-valve for the worsening of the living conditions of the Egyptian people, the people mean business.

A few days after the Egyptian Government has made its demands known, Nur Sard Pasha, the most obedient British puppet in Iraq, declared that the Anglo-Iraqui Treaty is out of date. This is to forestall the rising demand of the Iraqui people for the British to leave Iraq.

The National Liberation movement comprises practically every important section of the population. The people demand action not words. An indication of the growing crisis of imperialism is the frequent change of governments in the Middle East. A government seems not able to be 'in power' more than a few months, and the puppet governments can only exist on the support of British bayonets.

It is our duty to assist the peoples of the Middle East in the fight for their independence. The achievement of real independence by countries like Egypt and Iraq will be a powerful contribution in the cause of peace. British Imperialism will not quit peacefully as can already be seen from the hostile statements made in the House of Commons by Tories and Labour members. But the pressure from the National Liberation movement and our campaign here will force the Government's hands.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEN POINTS FOR PEACE

The Second World Peace Congress held in Warsaw with 1,656 delegates from 80 countries made an appeal to the United Nations and to the Parliaments of all countries, the main part of which was the following Ten Points:

A PLAN FOR PEACE

1. In view of the fact that the war now raging in Korea is not only bringing incalculable disaster upon the people of Korea, but also threatens to become a general war, we demand the immediate cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal from Korea of foreign armies, and the peaceful settlement of the internal conflict between the two parts of Korea, with the participation of the representatives of the Korean people. We demand that the problem be dealt with by the Security Council as properly constituted—that is, including the lawful representatives of the Chinese People's Republic. We call for the termination of the intervention by American forces on the Chinese island of Formosa and the cessation of hostilities against the Republic of Viet Nam—operations which both carry a latent threat of extension on a world scale.

2. We categorically condemn every move made and measure taken to violate the international agreements that forbid the rearmament of Germany and Japan. These attempts constitute a grave threat to peace. We demand the conclusion of a peace with a united and demilitarised Germany, the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan, and the withdrawal from both these countries of the forces of occupation.

3. We consider the violence employed to hold peoples in a state of dependence and colonial subjection operates as a powerful menace to peace, and proclaim the right of those peoples to freedom and independence. At the same time we raise our voices against every form of racial discrimination, for it promotes hatred among the nations and is dangerous to peace.

AGAINST AGGRESSION

4. We consider it necessary to expose the attempts made by the supporters of aggression to confuse the very meaning of what constitutes aggression and to intervene under one pretext or another in the internal affairs of other nations. We declare that no political or economic consideration, no reason arising from the internal situation or any internal conflict in a State can justify armed intervention by any other State. That State commits the crime of aggression which first employs armed force under any pretext whatever against any other State.

5. We hold that propaganda for a new war constitutes a grave threat to the peaceful co-operation of peoples, and we therefore hold it to be a crime of the deepest gravity against humanity. We appeal to the parliaments of all countries to enact a 'Law for the Protection of Peace', which shall render all those who conduct propaganda for a new war, whatever form it may take, liable to criminal prosecution.

6. As all decent people, whatever their political colour, regard ruthless mass destruction of populations as a crime against humanity, we demand that an international court shall be appointed to examine the crimes committed during the war in Korea,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in particular the question of the responsibility of General MacArthur.

DISARMAMENT

7. Voicing the demands of the peoples, who bear upon their shoulders the burdens of military budgets, and firmly resolved to guarantee to the whole of humanity firm and stable peace, we present for the consideration of the United Nations, of all parliaments and of all peoples, the following proposals:

Unconditional prohibition of all manner of atomic weapons and of bacteriological, chemical, radioactive, and all other devices of mass destruction (this prohibition being ensured by rigorous international control), and a declaration that the government that first henceforth employs such means shall be considered guilty of a criminal act.

Reduction by the Five Great Powers, in the course of the year 1951-52, of all their armed forces on land, on the sea and in the air, by the same proportions and by simultaneous stages, to one-half or one-third of their present size.

Organisation of an international central body within the framework of the Security Council, with the authority to inspect and supervise the carrying out of the prohibition of atomic, bacteriological, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction, and the reduction of armaments, with the right of checking not only declared weapons but also those the existence of which is suspected and which have not been declared.

These proposals constitute a first stage on the road to general and complete disarmament, the final goal of all Defenders of Peace. They would result in no military advantages to any country. They would call a halt to the drive to war. They would advance the well-being of every people.

8. We emphasise that in certain countries the passage from a peace economy to a war economy is increasingly disturbing normal economic relations and the exchange between countries both of materials and industrial goods. It is our view that this exerts a pernicious influence on the standards of living of many peoples, that it is raising obstacles to economic interests and business relations, and that this situation is a source of conflict endangering the peace of the world. Taking into consideration the vital interest of the populations of all countries and with the desire to improve conditions throughout the world, we urge the restoration of normal trading relations between the various countries on a basis of mutual interest, satisfying the requirements of the peoples concerned, excluding economic discrimination in any form and safeguarding the development of each national economy and the economic independence of all States, large and small.

9. We hold that obstruction of cultural relations among the peoples leads to quarrelling and loss of mutual understanding and creates a kind of distrust favourable to propaganda for war. We consider, on the other hand, that the strengthening of cultural relations between peoples creates conditions favourable to mutual understanding and strengthens their trust in the general struggle for peace. Accordingly, we appeal to all governments, urging them to contribute towards bettering cultural relations among the peoples, to enable them to become better acquainted with their respective treasures in the field of culture. We appeal to them also to facilitate the organisation of international conferences of persons active in the field of culture, the mutual exchange of visits, and the publication and wide distribution of the literature and art of other countries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE

10. We draw to the attention of the United Nations the fact that, while calling upon it to justify the hopes reposed in it by the peoples of the world, we are at the same time undertaking the establishment of a World Council of Peace. This World Council of Peace shall constitute a body comprising representatives of all the peoples of the world, those within the United Nations, those not yet represented therein, and also countries still dependent and colonial. It shall call upon the United Nations to fulfil its duty to strengthen and develop peaceful co-operation between all countries. It shall assume the lofty task of securing a firm and lasting peace that shall correspond to the vital interest of all the nations. The World Council of Peace will, in short, prove before mankind that in spite of present difficulties, which must in no wise be minimised, we shall accomplish the great mission of peace upon which we have embarked.

Book Reviews

POLLITT ON T.A.J.

Old Friends to Keep. T. A. Jackson. (119 pp. Lawrence and Wishart, 5*s.*)

FOR at least one reader in these trying and difficult times, T. A. Jackson in his new book *Old Friends to Keep* has brought back the days of his youth. All the books that I delved in when a youngster are here commented on and their significance and real meaning brought out by the author in a manner both educative and entertaining. Reading the book also brought back a memory that maybe the author has himself forgotten. It was in 1912, and I went to Leeds to speak at two meetings for the British Socialist Party. The first on Woodhouse Moor on the Sunday afternoon, the second in Albert Square at night. Alas, on the next platform to me was a man called T. A. Jackson, and he had a great crowd. I had the Chairman and myself. Ne'er a word passed from my lips. At night it was the same experience. Again I hadn't a chance in the world against the redoubtable Tommy. The people were his, and instead of proving what a wonderful orator I was, I found myself listening to an explanation of the works of George Meredith which I found fascinating. The effect on me was that I stinted myself, just as I had come out of my time, of buying a lot of things I had been looking forward to being able to get, and bought the complete collected works of Meredith. I therefore was very glad when T. A. Jackson had the idea of writing a series of articles for the *Daily Worker* on some of the classics of English literature, and happier still when I learned he was going to expand them and publish them in book form.

Well, here it is. I do not profess to be a learned critic. I know what I like to read and what I want to enjoy as well as being able to adorn the moral so to speak. And in this book I have found both pleasure and education. The author's introductory and closing words I found to be provocative and stimulating, as I am sure many others will do as well. I liked the hard hitting in the introduction, especially when it seems to be impossible for an Attlee or a Truman to make a speech without their sickening use of phrases about 'the virtues of their way of life', and how 'Communism has no thought for culture' and they alone are the sole repositories of 'moral values', 'Christian civilisation' and alone have a 'sense of spiritual values'. I think the author has these types in mind when he writes:

> The prostitution of the arts to the ends of advertising, the output of Hollywood and 'Tin-Pan

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alley', the pulp magazine, the strip cartoon, the tabloid press—these show the real 'concern' of the bourgeoisie for culture as surely as did the wholesale burning of books by the (bourgeoisie) Nazi counter-revolution in Germany.

And in these days when so many people have freed themselves from the shackles of capitalism and imperialism, and are literally performing miracles throughout the whole field of political, economic and cultural endeavour, it is good to be reminded of a passage from Gulliver again:

> Whoever could make two ears of corn or two blades of grass grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before would deserve better of mankind and do more essential service to his country, than the whole race of politicians put together.

When the threat of using the Atom Bomb against the Koreans is very real at the moment of writing, it will do us all good to remember that passage once again, and to realise that it is because so many of the working people in the world today are making two blades of grass grow where only one grew before, that the mad dogs of imperialism are furious and endeavour to destroy all these great gains of Socialism.

Thank you, Tommy, as from one old pal to another, for a book which I hope will have a very wide circulation, and will give both pleasure and a better understanding of the classics with which you have dealt.

HARRY POLLITT.

A NOTABLE RECORD

The London Trades Council 1860-1950. Foreword by Julius Jacobs. (160 pp. Lawrence and Wishart, 9*s.* 6*d.*)

NINETY-ONE years ago the London building trades workers appointed deputations to meet their employers to ask for a reduction of four-and-a-half hours in the normal working week. In one large firm, the employers not only rejected the appeal but instantly discharged the spokesman of the deputation. The workers on the job struck work for his reinstatement. The building trade unions backed the men and extended the fight to other jobs. The Master Builders' Association retaliated with a general lockout in the trade, throwing 24,000 workers on streets in the London area. They also announced that there would be no resumption of work until all the men submitted to their demand for the signing of a document renouncing for all time their membership of a trade union. The struggle lasted for seven months and the 'document' was defeated.

The workers in other trades were not slow to realise that the 'document' of the Master Builders was, in effect, a threat to the entire trade union movement and that if it was imposed in the building trade it would be extended to them. Therefore, they rallied to the support of the locked-out men with moral and financial assistance. Delegate conferences of the London trades met to organise their support and a fund of over £23,000 was raised to relieve the distress among the families of the men in dispute. The spirit of inter-trade workers' solidarity was born and two months after the lockout ended the Strike Committee called a Conference of London trades delegates on May 18, 1860, at which the Engineers' delegates moved a resolution, seconded by the Bookbinders, that a permanent Trades Council be formed. The Conference unanimously endorsed this motion and the London Trades Council was launched. From this historic event the book relates the numerous and varied activities of the Council during the past ninety years.

It is a most authentic piece of industrial history because the book is mainly based upon the Minutes and records of the Council. George Tait,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Central London Branch, National Union of Journalists, who has been chiefly responsible for the research and writing, deserves much praise for the very competent way in which he has brought those Minutes to life in a human and inspiring story of the London Trade Union movement. But, as this book shows, in many respects the activities of the L.T.C. have extended far beyond the boundaries of London, and it has played both a national and international part in the forward march of the working class. Between 1860 and 1868, before the Trades Union Congress was established, the L.T.C. was, in fact, doing a national job. Frequently, when industrial disputes arose in other parts of the country, the Unions involved made contact with the L.T.C. for practical assistance. Leaders of strikes often travelled to London to report to the L.T.C. and the Council responded by appointing delegates to visit the strike areas to give advice and render moral and financial assistance to the strikers. The L.T.C. also built contacts with the trade unions abroad before the first International Working Men's Association was formed in 1864. When Garibaldi, the Italian working-class hero, came to this country in 1864 the London Trades Council set the example of international working-class solidarity by organising a mighty demonstration of 50,000 workers to welcome him to London. Throughout the whole of its history the L.T.C. has maintained cordial relations in the international field. The numerous examples of practical support which the Council gave to the workers abroad engaged in struggle with the employers or oppressive Governments at the beginning of the present century, make a splendid chapter in the history of the Council. It is all the more striking when considered in contrast with the present low level to which the spirit of international working class solidarity has been reduced in the official trade union and Labour movement, by the conduct of the T.U.C. General Council and the foreign policy of the Labour Government.

The pages of this book are mirrors of contrast to many other contemporary expressions of official T.U.C. and Labour Party Policy. For instance, there are several accounts of the great protests organised by the London Trades Council against the action of the Government between 1860 and 1926 in using troops to break industrial disputes. In 1862, when Chelsea Barracks was being built, the Liberal Government sent soldiers to break a strike of building operatives. The London Trades Council immediately took up the battle against this action of the Government and organised a Petition to Parliament and a deputation to the War Office. Within ten days the Government was compelled by the agitation to withdraw the troops from the job. But today, under a Labour Government, the use of troops to break industrial disputes has become a common occurrence and no protest is made by the T.U.C.

In 1870 the L.T.C. conducted great agitations for the repeal of the Master and Servant Act under which workers were frequently imprisoned for 'breach of contract', which made strike action illegal. In the Beckton Gas Strike of 1872, six of the strikers were made an example of by the Government and sent to prison for breach of contract. The London Trades Council organised such a powerful agitation against these imprisonments that the Government was forced to release the men when they had only completed one third of their sentence. In 1875 the entire trade union movement in Britain celebrated the passing of new Labour Laws which in effect removed the odious Master and Servant Act. But alas, in 1950 we find a Labour Government prosecuting ten Gas Strikers under a new Master and Servant Act—Arbitration Order 1305! And having

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them sentenced to heavy fines for the crime of withholding their labour.

From time to time in the last half-century, the London Trades Council has raised its voice vigorously against heavy armaments expenditure, war preparations, and conscription. But has any Government in the past been more guilty of these offences against the working class than the Labour Government of to-day? This history of the London Trades Council is rich in the many hundreds of accounts of true working class activity during the past century. It does not point out the contrasts in present-day official Labour policy, but no reader could fail to discern them for himself.

In these days when the Labour Prime Minister is suffering so acutely from anti-Communist phobia, and when his public speeches sound like a gramophone record produced in the propaganda department of the American Foreign Office, it is interesting to read what he said in 1937 at a dinner organised by the London Trades Council and the Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee in celebration of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution. Proposing the toast of the evening, Mr. Attlee said:

> There are many people who still profess a fear of the Soviet Union, but that fear is not because they think it is an aggressive State that is out to conquer. . . The real fear of Soviet Russia is the fear that you should have a State going forward on a new principle, based on the principle of social justice. That is the really alarming thing to reactionaries all over the world.

I conclude this review with that illuminating quotation, and if you want more to refresh your mind on the past, and to stimulate your thoughts on the present, you must get the book!

WAL HANNINGTON.

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

High Treason: The Plot Against the People. Albert E. Kahn. (372 pp. Lear Publishers, New York, $1.00. Collet's, London, 8*s*.)

THIS is the story of the graft, corruption, terror and barbarity by which American imperialism has ridden the storm at home from the end of the First World War until the present day. Kahn, who will be remembered as the co-author of that brilliant book, *The Great Conspiracy*, traces here with equal thoroughness that plot against the American people which is hatched out of 'the fierce determination of a privileged minority to retain their power and increase their advantages at the expense of the great majority'. To accompany him round this Rogues' Gallery, to study these sharply etched portraits—Byrnes, Harding, MacArthur, Ford, the Hoovers, and all their sinister hangers-on; to review the abominations of the Palmer raids, the Teapot Dome scandal, the Sacco and Vanzetti case, the Memorial Day massacre, the Dallas and River Rouge outrages, the cartel arrangements with the Oswiecim killers, and the Peekskill riots, is to realise the full force of the fact that before an aggressive imperialism gets started on world conquest, it first commits the greatest crimes against its own progressives.

From the days of 1919 and 20, when 5,000 suspected 'radicals' were arrested and the prisoners beaten, tortured and forced to sign 'confessions', to any day in 1949 when the American Press reported —and heaven knows what is not reported! — the lynching, clubbing, flogging, stabbing and shooting of Negroes, the self-styled defenders of Western civilisation are seen for what they are; a pack of greedy degenerates, ignorant as cattle, brutish, vicious and powerful, governed by their lust for dollars and their poisoned hatred for Negroes, Jews,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trade Unionists, Communists, Socialists—for the whole of humankind, that is, which dares to challenge their right to rob men of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Throughout the book, as throughout the years it covers, there recur instances of despotic laws and the perversion of the instruments of justice. The trial of the twelve Communist leaders last year is but the latest occasion for the letting loose of the monstrous crew of labour spies, renegades, police informers, convicts, thieves, strong-arm men and stool-pigeons to file through the courtrooms, bearing false witness at the courteous bidding of corrupt prosecuting judges. The criminal record of the rulers of the United States during the past three decades is written in the very institutions they have brought into existence: the recognised firms which manufacture and sell to private industry, strike breaking and labour-espionage agencies—as well as to State and municipal 'law-enforcement' bodies —such 'protective' devices as shot guns, machine guns, gas ejectors, bombs and tear gas; the sinister Service Departments of big corporations, whose business it is to recruit from the gutter and direct the activities of the hired blackleg, Trade Union spy and thug.

It must come as something of a shock to the honest Trade Unionist here who is fed by his leaders on the cynical hypocrisy of calling America 'the most progressive State', and on the notion that British and American workers share a common tradition to realise that long after the passing of the belated Labour Relations Act of 1934, and well into the '40s Trade Unionists were still confronted with ferocious acts of reprisal and persecution, not stopping at murder.

Kahn has assembled his facts and his documents with exemplary skill. Save for somewhat uncritical veneration for F. D. Roosevelt, the story is told with great objectivity, and is the more telling—and the more dreadful—for such treatment. No one could read this book unmoved; but, though it inspires rage and anguish, every thinking man and woman in the Labour movement should read it, because it reveals the literally disgusting institutions we are called upon not only to emulate, but to defend with our lives, and also—what we here are sometimes apt to forget—the heroic struggles and sacrifices and the harsh sufferings of our American brothers in the fight for progress.

F. CARTER.

WITHOUT A CLUE

Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion. (Alex Inkeles. Harvard University Press $5, O.U.P. 32*s.* 6*d.* pp. 379 + xviii.)

THIS is another of those painstaking American compilations from Soviet source material whose conclusions are worthless because their compilers frankly haven't a clue to the basis of Soviet or any other society.

The author 'spent three years studying the Soviet Union as a social science analyst in the Department of State and other government agencies'. He describes the close touch kept by the Communist Party with public opinion, its conception of leadership as opposed to *khvostism*, and the changing forms of 'mass persuasion' as history develops. Yet his view of the historical process is so static that he considers Soviet 'mass persuasion' has failed because it is still carried on. He describes 'oral personal agitation', a specially Soviet phenomenon, but (perhaps thinking of *ward-heelers*) is puzzled because 'the Bolshevik political agitator . . . does not have a positive, rewarding goal such as taking power'; dare one remind such an impressive 'social science analyst' that the workers and peasants took power in 1917?

In detecting strains and conflicts of interest between the Party and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the masses. Mr. Inkeles is indebted to the Soviet practice of self-criticism. One pictures his massive card index, under headings like 'Possible Areas of Dysfunction' (*sic*), with scores of cross-references to slashing attacks on bureaucrats in the Soviet press. The economists used on this basis successively to prophesy the failure of each pre-war Five Year Plan. The robustness of Soviet economy during the war discouraged them, though Mr. Edward Crankshaw still does it in a rather faded way each Sunday in the *Observer*.

There are one or two useful tables showing the distribution of the Soviet press, radio and cinema, but in using any of the information, its source should be checked, particularly as in some cases the source quoted is 'discussions with displaced persons'. The style is flat and jargonised. Gladstone's verbosity is pellucid compared to statements like 'traditional Western liberalism . . . has sought to rely . . . on so structuring the individual's life situation that he is personally motivated to act in accord with socially defined expectations'.

JUDITH TODD.

FOCUS ON PEACE

Two Worlds in Focus: Studies of the Cold War. (134 pp. National Peace Council. 5*s*.)

CAN the Communist and the non-Communist worlds live together in peace? It has become so rare for this question to be discussed other than in terms of relative force that this book is welcome if only because the contributors to it do not assume that the only solution is an arms race. On the contrary, the premise from which it springs is that 'at least a working relationship between East and West must be established if war is to be avoided and any progress is to be made towards a common prosperity and a common peace'. It is an honest and sincere attempt to answer the question which should be studied by all who, like the contributors to the pamphlet, genuinely want peace. Its importance rests not only in the facts which it presents, but also in the mirror which it holds up to the ditherers in the peace movement. If we can understand these doubts and differences we can, with mutual respect, go far towards uniting the peace forces in this country. The contributions include valuable notes on the negotiations for the control of atomic energy by Dr. Alex Wood and an article on the bridge between Marxist and Christian values by Olaf Stapledon. To both this book is a fitting memorial in its purpose and its honesty.

DICK FREEMAN.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

Revolution in Eastern Europe. Doreen Warriner. Turnstile Press. 12s 6d. 188 pp.
The Stones of Bombay. David Martin. Allan Wingate. 9s 6d. 224 pp.
Peace Is Our Answer. Noel Counihan, Paul Eluard, Pablo Neruda, Louis Aragon. Collet's, 4s. 40 pp.
In Defence of Philosophy. Maurice Cornforth. Lawrence & Wishart. 12s 6d. 260 pp.
Crisis in Britain. Robert Brady. University of California. Cambridge University Press. 37s 6d. 730 pp.
Women and Communism. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin. Lawrence & Wishart. 3s 6d. 104 pp.
The British Group. C. E. Key. G. G. Harrap. 12s 6d. 256 pp.
Lysenko is Right. James Fyfe. Lawrence & Wishart. 2s 6d. 66 pp.

PAMPHLETS

Patriotism and Internationalism. S. Titarenko. Soviet News. 1d. 16 pp.
Soviet Speeches at the World Peace Congress. A. Fadeyev, I. Ehrenburg. Soviet News. 1d. 20 pp.
The Soviet Union at the Fifth Session at U.N.O. Soviet News. 3d. 100 pp.
U.S.S.R. Builds for Peace. Soviet News. 1d. 20 pp.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well as the head. No "Tom Noddy, all head and no body" about these!' From the South: 'I have never read such a magnificent analysis of any great man's place in world history. For me, that article will make valuable reading in 30 years' time, when Shaw and the principles he fought for will have long since come into their own'. So our 1951 series of pamphlets has opened with a bang with No. 1, the new *Shaw Memorial* (1s.). Repeated demands for a reprint of D. N. Pritt's article *The Truth About the U.S.S.R.* (November issue) decided the Editorial Board to make it one of the series at 6d. See back cover for these and other publications.

Owing to unforeseen circumstances, the bound volume for 1950 may not be ready until February. There's a cheerful side to the picture, however; those who meant to exchange their loose copies and 8s. 6d. for a bound volume still have time—but not much—to do so.

The fund, doubled by big dollar gifts, reflects the pinch many know all too well. Letters tell of unemployment, sickness, chronic under-pay, high prices. (An Old Age Pensioner: 'You know how far 26s. will go—but all the best'. From Devon: 'Never has money been so short—or time'. From Sussex: 'Sorry the pie I couldn't let you have twelve months ago is still in the sky'.) Others, though they can't run to cash, regularly give us the benefit of their Co-op. 'divi'—a quiet gesture which we appreciate very much indeed. The November total was

£72

STAND-IN money came from:

'Islingtonian', standing-in for St. Pancras, 1s; J. Tuckett, standing-in for Manchester, 1s; D. Mayo, standing-in for Plymouth and Rottingdean, 2s; 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy, 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s; 'Exeter', standing-in for Birmingham, Crediton, Dublin, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Norwich, Swansea, Turton (Lancs) and Weymouth, 8s; 'Bath', standing-in for Aylesbury, Cardiff, Totnes, Warwick and Watford, 5s; 'Socialist Airman', standing-in for Merthyr Tydfil, 1s; C. M. Hall, standing-in for Ayr, Brechin, Thurso and Wick (prepaid).

STEADY money came from:

'Islington', 1s; 'Leicester', 10s; Anon., 'Whitchurch', 1s; C.B., 'Bristol', 1s 6d; 'Exeter', 2s; 'Bath', 5s; 'Ilfracombe' (prepaid); 'Aberdeen' (prepaid); 'Grangemouth' (prepaid); 'Kingussie', for 'Inverness' (prepaid); 'New York' (prepaid); 'Belfast' (prepaid); J. Tuckett, 1s 6d; D. Mayo, 10s; 'Socialist Airman', for 'Taunton', 1s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; D. Rees, £1; H.G.B., 2s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; Royston Green, 7s; R.F.B., £3; D. M. Clarke, 10s; L. Rowan, 6s; H.S.M., 2s 6d; K. Kennedy, 2s 6d; S. Mill, 10s; 'L'Humanité', 3s; G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert, 5s; H. N. Humphries, 3s 6d; T.W.R., £1 8s; S. Morrissy, 10s; A.F.O., 1s 6d; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s; T. Flood, 2s 6d; O. Greene, £2; H. Tinkler, 5s; F. Renouf, 5s; R. McLeod, 5s; H. Willcox, 2s; R. Eldridge, 4s; Director, £2; D.M., 6s; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d.

Other contributions include:

L. Brooks, 1s 6d; Bryn Thomas, 3s; H. Sherwen, 4s; G. J. R. Hill, 3s; H. F. List, 9s; W. T. West, 4s; R. Weare, 8s; Anon. I, 3s; L. Ward, 1s; R. C. Champion, 3s; T.S.B. (U.S.A.), 11s 6d; D.P.H., 12s; J. Nathan, 8s; G. Darby, 8s; F. G. Musgrave, 2s; D.B., 12s; 'Surrey Reader', £1 8s; C. Wrench, 3s; M. N. Tempest, 7s 3d; W. J. Moylan, 5s 3d; A. Rawson, 8s; L. Milnes, 10s; P. W. Ghosh, 3s; J. O. Steele, 6s 6d; N. Shaw, 1s; J. Finnemore, 8s; C.B. (Sth Africa), 4s; A. E. Turner, 5s 3d; P. Jamieson, 3s; I. ap Nicholas, 8s; 'Co-op. Divi.', 3s 6d; G. F. Schafer, 5s; R. G. Cragg, 4s; L. Blott, 8s; A. Singer, 8s; B. Neville, 10s; D. A. Hamilton, 8s; M. Mackenzie, 5s 4d; J.B. (Sth Africa), 5s; A. Middlemass, 3s; W. Rickard, 8s; J. J. Christie, 8s; J. P. Mortimore, 4s; M.E.H. (U.S.A.), 13s; H. J. Knight, 4s; M. B. Laverty, 5s; J. McQueen, 8s; J. McCallum, 8s; J. Melrick, 2s; E. R. Watson, 2s; E.R.H. (Sth Africa), 4s 5d; R. Herring, 3s; H. Horinsky, 8s; H. N. Merrion, 10s; E. Hunt, 1s; F. Willetts, 8s; L.F.P. (U.S.A.), 10s 6d; 'Notes of the Month Admirer' (U.S.A.), £35.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Co-op. Number L.99482.

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

KOREA
Handbook

The book defenders of peace need to study increasingly, and to give their friends as an eye-opener.

96 pp. Stiff Covers. 2s. 6d.

'Labour Monthly' Pamphlets, 1951 Series

The
SHAW
Memorial
Pamphlet

A Memoir by R. Palme Dutt, with Shaw's famous article, 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat', from 'Labour Monthly', 1921.

32 pp. Photograph. 1s.

D. N. PRITT'S

'The Truth About The U.S.S.R.'

16 pp. Price 6d.

J. D. BERNAL'S

'The Way to Peace'
24 pp. Price 6d.

Order from all newsagents, or **Dept. M., 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.**

Voice of Democratic India
READ
CROSSROADS
For

First-hand Reports on Indian People's Struggle and South-East Asian Countries' Fight against Imperialism and for National Independence.

Editor:
ROMESH THAPAR

Yearly Subs. Rates:
Rs.12 Inland.
30s. for Continent.
$6.00 for U.S.A.

Wanted, Agents in Foreign Capitals.

Write to: P.O.B. 4062, BOMBAY 7, India.

LABOUR RESEARCH

January issue includes:
'Tories and the Cost of Living'
'The Knockshinnoch Inquiry'
'Order 1305'
'The Leasehold Bill'

Monthly 6d.; p.a., 7s.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2 Soho Square, London, W.1

CIRCULATION-RAISER No. 1

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name.....

Address.....

(2) Name.....

Address.....

You may mention my name (Signed).....

or/ I enclose note to be sent on. Address.....

.....

To the Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED